

Including  
Deep Comparative Studies of Hamito-Semitic and Indo-European  
and  
of Hamito-Semitic and Sino-Tibetan on All Levels of Structure

# Deep Comparative Studies of Hamito-Semitic and Indo-European and of Hamito-Semitic and Sino-Tibetan on All Levels of Structure

By **EL RABIH MAKKI**

**Ph. D., M.S. in Linguistics (Georgetown University)**

**M. A. in Near Eastern Languages (Wayne State University)**

## Publishers & Distribution



**DECOMPOSITION OF HAMITO-SEMITIC ROOTS  
INTO THEIR ULTIMATE PRIMEVAL COMPONENTS**

Including  
Deep Comparative Studies of Hamito-Semitic and Indo-European  
and  
of Hamito-Semitic and Sino-Tibetan on All Levels of Structure



# **DECOMPOSITION OF HAMITO-SEMITIC ROOTS INTO THEIR ULTIMATE PRIMEVAL COMPONENTS**

Including  
Deep Comparative Studies of Hamito-Semitic and Indo-European  
and  
of Hamito-Semitic and Sino-Tibetan on All Levels of Structure

By

**EL RABIH MAKKI**

Ph. D., M.S. in Linguistics (Georgetown University)

M. A. in Near Eastern Languages (Wayne State University)



**Bissan**

Publishers & Distribution

© **El Rabih Makki, 2013**

First published in 2013

**Bissan Publishers and Distribution**

P.O.Box: 13-5261 Beirut - Lebanon

Telefax: 00961 1 351291

E-mail: [info@bissan-bookshop.com](mailto:info@bissan-bookshop.com)

Website: [www.bissan-bookshop.com](http://www.bissan-bookshop.com)

All Rights reserved for the author. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or other means now known or here-after invented, without a prior permission in writing from the author.

## *CONTENTS*

Language Cited: Hamito-Semitic	v
Language Cited: Indo-European	vii
Abbreviations for some Dictionaries and References	viii
Abbreviations for Anthologies of some Pre-Islamic Poets	x
Grammatical Terminology and Other Abbreviations and Symbols	x

<i>PREFACE</i>	1
----------------	---

## *I. HAMITO-SEMITIC FAMILY OF LANGUAGES*

1.1 Hamito-Semitic Family of Languages	5
1.1.1 Semitic Languages	5
1.1.1.1 Akkadian	6
1.1.1.2 Canaanite	6
1.1.1.3 Aramaic	6
1.1.1.4 Classical Arabic	7
1.1.1.5 Epigraphic South Arabic	7
1.1.1.6 Ethiopic	7
1.1.2 Hamitic Languages	8
1.1.2.1 Egyptian	8
1.1.2.2 Berber	8
1.1.2.3 Cushitic	8
1.1.2.4 Chadic	8
1.1.3 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Sound System	9
1.1.4 Comments on the sound correspondences between Semitic and Egyptian	9
1.1.4.1 Stops	10
1.1.4.2 Fricatives	11
1.1.4.3 Nasals	14
1.1.4.4 Laterals	14
1.1.4.5 r-sound	14
1.1.4.6 Semivowels	14
1.1.5 Comments on Vowel Changes	14
1.1.6 Diphthongs	15

## *II. HAMITO-SEMITIC ROOT STRUCTURE*

2.1. Introduction	17
2.1.1 Semitic and Cushitic	18
2.1.2 Semitic and Egyptian	18

2.1.3 Critical Review of some Works on Hamito-Semitic	19
2.1.6 Ahmad Bin Faris	27
2.1.6.1 Bin Faris' View on Doubled Roots	28
2.1.6.2 Bin Faris' View on Reduplicative Roots	28
2.1.6.3 Bin Faris' View on Roots with more than Three Radicals	29
2.1.6.4 Bin Faris' View on Suffixed /-d/	29
2.1.6.5 Bin Faris' View on Prefixed /d-/	29
2.1.6.5.1 Evidence for an Earlier /d-/ in Hamito-Semitic	31
2.1.6.6 Bin Faris' View on Suffixed /-l/	42
2.1.6.7 Bin Faris' View on Suffixed /-r/	45
2.1.6.8 Bin Faris' View on Suffixed /-k/	48
2.1.6.9 Bin Faris' View on Suffixed /-s/	49
2.1.6.10 Bin Faris' View on Blending	52
2.1.6.11 Bin Faris' Dictionary: Semantic Approach	52
2.1.7 Semitic Root Structure	54
2.1.7.1 Subclasses of Semitic Strong Roots	55
2.1.7.2 Subclasses of Semitic Weak Roots	56
2.1.7.3 Derived Stems	56
2.1.8 Weaknesses of the Traditional Approach	59
2.1.8.1 Surface and Deep Structure of a Triliteral Root	59
2.1.9 Decisive Arguments for an Underlying Biliteral Structure	61
2.1.10 Abstract Versus Special Meaning	70
2.1.11 Meaning and Type of the Root-Determinative	77
2.1.12 Methodology	77
2.1.13 Weak and Doubled Roots	79
2.1.14 Theories Built on Weak and Doubled Roots: Critical Review	83
2.2 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Causative /š-/	89
2.3 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Causative /ʔ-/	129
2.4 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Proot /h-/	157
2.5 Proto-Hamito-Semitic infix /-h-/	165
2.6 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Proot /y-/	169
2.7 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Proot /t-/	181
2.8 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Proot /-t-/	197
2.9 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Proot /-t/	215
2.10 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Proot /m-/	225
2.11 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Proot /n-/	247
2.12 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Proot /w-/	295
2.13 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Proot /b-/	327
2.14 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Proot /ʕ-/	341
2.15 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Proot /r-/	347
2.16 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Proot /h-/	357
2.17 Compounds of Miscellaneous Elements	371
2.18 The Definite Article	429

2.19 Comparison of Adjective	431
2.20 Some Proto-Hamito-Semitic Demonstratives, Interrogative, Adverbs, and Prepositions	439
2.21 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Negatives	453
2.22 Tenses	467
2.22.1 Additional Remarks on Tenses	470
2.22.2 Personal Pronouns	473
2.23 Names of Animals in Hamito-Semitic	479
2.23.1 Names Ending in –r	479
2.23.2 Names Ending in –l	481
2.23.3 Names Ending in –b	483
2.23.4 Metathesis and Animal names	489
2.23.5 Names Ending in –š and –θ	490
2.23.6 Names Ending in –m and –n	492
2.24 Foreign Words in Classical Arabic	495
2.25 Concluding Remarks on <i>Proto-Hamito-Semitic Proots and its Phonemes.</i> <i>Views on the Original Part of Speech, on Language Change and its Stages of</i> <i>Development, on the Concept of ‘deep Structure’, on Syntax and Word Order, on the</i> <i>Origin of Language and how it arose, on Animal and Human Communications, on the</i> <i>Direct Relation between Meaning and Word, on Comparative Linguistics, on</i> <i>Borrowing, on Hamito-Semitic and Sino-Tibetan Families.</i>	511

### III. COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INDO-EUROPEAN AND HAMITO-SEMITIC FAMILIES OF LANGUAGES

3.1 Indo-European Family of Languages	533
3.1.1 Hittite	534
3.1.2 Indo-Iranian	534
3.1.3 Greek	534
3.1.4 Italic	535
3.1.5 Celtic	535
3.1.6 Germanic	535
3.1.7 Tocharian	535
3.1.8 Balto-Slavic	536
3.1.9 Armenian	536
3.1.10 Albanian	536
3.1.11 Proto-Indo-European Sound System	536
3.1.12 The Laryngeal Theory	537
3.2 Proto-IE-HS /q/	541
3.3 Proto-IE-HS /k/	563
3.4 Proto-IE-HS /g/	581
3.5 Proto-IE-HS /t/	601
3.6 Proto-IE-HS /d/	617



3.7 Proto-IE-HS /ǵ/	629
3.8 Proto-IE-HS /p/	643
3.9 Proto-IE-HS /b/	661
3.10 Proto-IE-HS /š ~s/	677
3.11 Proto-IE-HS /θ/	687
3.12 Proto-IE-HS /r/	691
3.13 Proto-IE-HS /l/	699
3.14 Proto-IE-HS /m/	707
3.15 Proto-IE-HS /n/	717
3.16 Proto-IE-HS /w/	725
3.17 Proto-IE-HS /y/	735
3.18 Additional IE-HS Word Correspondences	739
3.19 IE-HS Grammatical systems: <i>Derivational and Inflectional Affixes</i>	745
3.19.1 Word-Formation: Compounding	745
3.19.2 Derivational Affixes	745
3.19.3 Inflectional Affixes	750
<i>REFERENCES</i>	757

### *Languages Cited (Hamito-Semitic)*

A. = Aymellel  
Ag. = Agaw  
Af. = 'Afar  
Akk. = Akkadian  
Amh. = Amharic  
Amm. = Ammorite  
Arg. = Argoba  
Aram. = Aramaic  
Assyr. = Assyrian  
Bab. = Babylonian  
Bad. = Badditu  
Bed. = Bedja  
B = Biblical  
BAram. = Biblical Aramaic  
BHeb. = Biblical Hebrew  
Bil. = Bilin  
Can. = Canaanite  
Chad. = Chadic  
Č. = Chaha  
Cush. = Cushitic  
CA = Classical Arabic  
Copt. = Coptic  
Ed. = Endegen  
Edom. = Edomite  
E. = Eža  
Egyp. = Old Egyptian  
En. = Ennemor  
E. = Epigraphic (before a language name as in EHeb = Epigraphic Hebrew, etc.)  
ESA = Epigraphic South Arabian  
Eth. = Ethiopic  
Ga. = Galla  
Gaf. = Gafat  
Ge. = Ge'ez (or Ethiopic)  
Gid. = Gidole  
Go. = Gogot  
Gt. = Gyete  
Gur. = Gurage  
HS = Hamito-Semitic  
Had. = Hadiya  
Him. = Himyaritic  
Haď. = Haďarmautian  
Har. = Harari

Heb. = Hebrew  
 JAram. = Jewish Aramaic  
 Jp. = Judaic Palestinian  
 Kab. = Kabyle  
 Kam. = Kambatta  
 Lih. = Liḥyanitic  
 Mand. = Mandaic  
 Meh. = Mehri  
 Min. = Minaean  
 MSA = Modern Standard Arabic  
 Ms = Masqan  
 M. = Muher  
 Nab. = Nabatean  
 NWS = North-west Semitic  
 NWSI = North-west Semitic Inscriptions  
 OffAram. = Official Aramaic  
 O = Old (before a language name)  
 OAram. = Old Aramaic  
 Palm. = Palmyrenean  
 PHS = Proto-Hamito-Semitic  
 Pun. = Punic  
 Phoen. = Phoenician  
 Qab. = Qabenna  
 Qat = Qatabanian  
 Qem. = Qement  
 S. = Selti  
 SA = South Arabian  
 Sab. = Sabaen  
 Sa. = Saho  
 Sid. = Sidamo  
 Syr. = Syriac  
 Saf. = Safaitic  
 Samal = Samalian  
 Saf. = Safaitic  
 Shil. = Shilhā  
 SL = Southern Lebanese dialect  
 Som. = Somali  
 Soq. = Soqotri  
 Shḥ. = Shḥuri  
 Talm. = Talmudic  
 Targ. = Targumic  
 Tham. = Thamudian  
 Te. = Tigre  
 Tna. = Tigrina

Ug. = Ugaritic  
W. = Wolane  
Wol. = Wolamo  
Z. = Zway

*Languages Cited (Indo-European)*

Alb. = Albanian  
Arm. = Armenian  
Att. = Attic  
Avest. = Avestan  
Balt. = Baltic  
Br. = Breton  
B.-Sl. = Balto-Slavic  
Bulg. = Bulgarian  
Cor. = Cornish  
Cz. = Czech  
Dan. = Danish  
Dor. = Doric  
Du = Dutch  
E. = English  
Gaul. = Gaulish  
Go. = Gothic  
Grm. = Germanic (for general Germanic)  
Grk = Greek  
Hit. = Hittite  
IH = Indo-Hittite  
IHL = Indo-Hittite laryngeal(s)  
Icel. = Icelandic  
IE = Indo-European  
Ir. = Irish  
Lat. = Latin  
Let. = Lettish or Latvia  
Lith. = Lithuanian  
M. = Middle (before a language name as in ME = Middle English, MIr = Middle Irish, etc.)  
Myc. = Mycenaean  
O = Old (before a language name)  
OCS = Old Church Slavic  
OE = Old English  
OHG = Old High German  
OIcel. = Old Icelandic  
OIr. = Old Irish  
ON = Old Norse  
OPers. = Old Persian

OSax. = Old Saxon  
Osc. = Oscan  
OW = Old Welsh  
Pers. = Persian  
Phryg. = Phrygian  
Pol. = Polish  
Russ. = Russian  
Skt. = Sanskrit  
SCr. = Serbo-Croatian  
Sl. = Slavic  
Toch. = Tocharian  
Umb. = Umbrian  
Ved. = Vedic  
W. = Welsh

### *Abbreviations for Some Dictionaries and References*

Al 'Ayn = *Kitāb Al 'Ayn*, a Classical Arabic dictionary, 8 Volumes. Khalil Bin Ahmad Al Farāhidi.

AG = *Akkadian Grammar & Glossary in Akkadian of Alalah*. George Giacumakis.

AG = *Ancient Aramaic Glossaries in An Aramaic Handbook*, pp. 1-15. Franz Rosenthal and André Dupont-Sommer

Amāli = *Kitāb Al Amāli*, a study of the language and diverse literary texts, 2 Volumes. Abu Ali Kāli.

CCG = *A Concise Comparative Celtic Grammar*. Henry Lewis and Holgen Pedersen.

HCG = *A Comparative Grammar of The Hittite Language*. Edgar H. Sturtevant and E. Adelaide Hahn.

DRLE = *Dictionnaire des Racines des langues Européennes*. Grandsaignes R. D'hauterive.

DRS = *Dictionnaire des Racine Sémitiques*. David Cohen.

EHD = *Egyptian Hieroglyphic Dictionary*, 2 Volumes. E. A. Wallis Budge.

FL = *Fiqh Al Luyah was Sirru Al Arabiyah*. Abdul Malak Tha'ā'libi

HED = *Harari Etymological Dictionary*. Wolf Leslau.

HGG = *Historical Germanic Grammar*. Joseph Wright.

HSED = *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary*. Vladimir E. Orel and Olga V. Stolbova.

IECD = *An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary*. Stuart E. Mann.

IER = *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*. Calvert Watkins (ed.).

IHL = *The Indo-Hittite Laryngeals*. Edgar H. Sturtevant.

IEV = *Le Vocabulaire Indo-Européennes*. Delamarre, X.

Jamharah = *Jamharah Al Luyah*, a Classical Arabic dictionary, 3 Volumes. Ibin Durayd.

JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

LA = *Lisān Al Arab*, a Classical Arabic dictionary, 4 Volumes. Jamāl Ad Dīn Ibin Mandūr

MA = *Mu'ġam Al Aşma'i*, a Classical Arabic dictionary.

MD = *Mandaic Dictionary*. E. S. Drower and R. Macuch.

ML = *Maḳāyīs Al Luyah*, a Classical Arabic Dictionary, 6 Volumes. Ahmad Bin Fāris.

OT = *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. William Gesenius.

PG = *Phonetician Grammar*. Harris Zellig S.

RPAA = *Reconstructing Proto-Afro-Asiatic: Words, Tone, Consonants*. Ehret Christopher.

SD = *Sabaeen Dictinary*. Beeston A. F. L at al.

SL = *The Sanskrit Language*. Thomas Burrow

SS = *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*. Carl D. Buck.

Şāhibi = *Al Şāhibi*. Ahmad Bin Faris.

ŞHH = *Şihāḥ*, a Classical Arabic Dictionary, 6 Volumes. Ismā'īl Jawhari.

SOE = *The Science of Etymology*. Walter Skeat.

VPHS = *Sur le Vocabulaire et la Phonetique du Chamito-Semitique*. Marcel Cohen.

UG = *Ugaritic Glossary*. Hary A. Hoffner, in Gordon, Cyrus H., *Ugaritic Textbook*.

WP = Walde, Alois and Pokorny, Julius. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indo-germanischen Sprachen*.

### *Abbreviations for Anthologies of Some Pre-Islamic Poets*

D = *Diwān* = anthology

DA = *Diwān Al A'sha*. Dār Ṣaab, Beirut.

DD = *Diwān Durayd Bin Aṣ Ṣimmah*. Dār Ṣaab, Beirut.

DI = *Diwān Imri' Al Qays*. Mu'assasat A'lami, Beirut.

DK = *Diwān Al Khansā'*. Dār Ṣaab, Beirut.

DL = *Diwān Labīb Bin Rabī'ah Al 'Amiri*. Dār Beirut. Beirut.

DM = *Diwān Al Muhalhal*, Dār Saab, Beirut.

DN = *Diwān Al Nābiyah Al Thubyāni*. Mu'assasat Al Nūr, Beirut.

DṬ = *Diwān ṭarfah Bin Al Abd Al Bakri*. Dār Ṣaab, Beirut.

DZ = *Diwān Zuhair bin Abi Salma*. Dār Al Kutub, Beirut.

JAA = *Jamharat Aṣ'ār Al Arab* (Anthology of pre-Islamic and Early Islam Poems), written by M. bin Khaṭṭāb Al Quraṣi (lived in the 3rd c. H). Dār Al Kutub Al 'ilmiyyah, Beirut.

Š & Š' = *Aṣ Ṣi'r wa Aṣ Ṣu'arā'*, written by Abdu Allah Bin Muslim Bin Qutaybah Al Daynūri (died in 276 H). The book also called *Ṭabaḳāt Al Ṣu'arā'*, i.e. *Poetry and Poets*.

ŠM = *Sharh Al Mu'allafāt As Sab'*, written by M. Az Zawzani (died in 486 H). Dār Al Jil. Beirut.

### *Grammatical Terminology and Other Abbreviations and Symbols*

abl = ablative

adj. = adjective

acc. = accusative

assim. = assimilation

arch. = archaic

ca = about

caus. = causative

C = class or stem of verbs as in CA CI *kataba*, CII *kattaba*, CIII *kātaba*, etc.

C = consonant

coll. = collective

comp = compare, comparative

cpd = compound; pl. cpds  
 dat. = dative case  
 dial. = dialect(s), dialectal  
 dim. = diminutive  
 dissim. = dissimilation  
 du. = dual  
 ɤ = *unidentified vowel or diphthong*  
 ed. = editor  
 ext. = extension  
 e.g. = for example  
 fem. = feminine  
 fr. = from  
 gen. = general as in gen. Sem. = general Semitic  
 gen. = genitive  
 H. = Hijrah, dates the beginning of the Islamic era  
*Hadith* = *sayings*, correspondence and speeches of the Prophet and other leading men in  
     early Islam  
 ibid. = in the same work  
 id. = the same meaning  
 i.e = that is  
 imperf. = imperfect tense  
 imper. = imperative  
 ind. = indicative  
 inf. = infinitive  
 inst. = instrumental  
 intrans. = intransitive  
 lit. = literal(ly)  
 loc. = locative  
 masc. = masculine  
 metaph. = metaphor(ic/-ally)  
 neg. = negative  
 neut. = neuter  
 nom. = nominative  
 n. = noun  
 n. = number, numbers  
 obsol. = obsolete  
 op.cit. = in the work cited  
 orig. = origin(al)(-ly)  
 part. = participle  
 pp. = past participle  
 pass. = passive  
 perf. = perfect tense  
 perh. = perhaps  
 pers. = person(al)



pl. = plural  
 Poet. = Poet(ry)  
 PIP = Pre-Islamic Poet(ry)  
 poss. = possessive  
 prep. = preposition  
 prob. = probably  
 proot = p(rimeval) root  
 pron. = pronoun, pronominal  
 recipr. = reciprocal  
 redupl. = reduplication  
 reflx. = reflexive  
 r. = root, roots  
 seq. const. = sequential constraint  
 sg. = singular  
 s.o = some one  
 s.t. = something  
 ult. = ultimately  
 usu. = usual(ly)  
 trans. = transitive  
 transl. = translated  
 vb = verb  
 vl. = voiceless  
 vs = versus, against  
 \* = asterisk, used before a linguistic form to indicate that the form is unattested.  
 v. = vowel  
 v. = voiced  
 W = *unidentified semivowel* (y, w, or ')  
 = signifies, has the same meaning as, corresponds to  
 > develops into, becomes  
 < comes from, is derived from  
 ~ variant of, alternates with  
 ; = a derivative of, derives into as in kataba “write”; kattaba “make one write”  
 ¯ = macron, a sign of vowel length  
 Ø = zero  
 : = all are from, is from, cognate with  
 ( ) = anything between parentheses can be dropped.

## PREFACE

*Man has preserved intact one obvious trace unveiling his genealogy; it is language.*

How can we demonstrate that world's languages are all related to one another? What method or methods should be employed to prove scientifically this linguistic relationship? Have world's languages preserved sufficient linguistic evidence that enable us to establish their genetic relatedness?

Since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, there have been repeated attempts to establish connections among languages unknown to be related. More recent attempts aim at establishing distant linguistic relationships such as the Nostratic family. All such attempts have been considered by the majority of linguists as premature and poorly established. Moreover, practicing historical and comparative linguists consider it impossible at the present state of our knowledge to establish new language families and broader linguistic relationships.

The general idea gathered from the foregoing paragraph suggests that the only possible way to establish new genetic relationships among languages or prove that world's languages are genetically related is to '*re-examine*' the linguistic data we have at our disposal with the purpose of searching for new discoveries capable of disproving and putting an end to all traditional views, theories and assumptions built on language. Without new discoveries all attempts to establish new genetic relationships are doomed to failure.

The present book is a flood of linguistic discoveries that sweeps before it *all theories and views* that have thus far been built on language as well as *all methods* of historical

and comparative investigation of language as have been advanced by Indoeuropeanists since the early 19<sup>th</sup> century and followed closely by their disciples throughout the world.

A sample example from the book that may be cited here to show the kind of our new discoveries is the root ‘*bind*’ (Proto-IE \*bhendh- as in Skt. bandh-, Proto-HS \*band- as in Egyp. bnd, etc.), which is traditionally treated as an indivisible entity or ‘*root*’. Discovered evidence shows clearly that ‘*bind*’ is a complex word consisting of at least three primeval roots (or *proots*) agglutinated together: [ba’-], [naw-] and [-d-], and that the signification ‘*bind*’ is expressed only by [naw-] (for the irrefutable evidence, see §§2.13.5 & 3.9.24 below). The three elements, together with their historically last development [band], are preserved intact in HS, notably in Egyp. and CA. The proot [naw-] is expected to be found with the same or similar meanings in world’s families of languages. In accordance with this unquestionable fact, IE-HS \*band- truly represents the last of many ancient multilayered structure. A second and earlier surface structure \*nawd- “bind” has also been preserved in IE, HS (see §3.9.24 below), and many other language families. In the light of this new discovery: *How can we trust what the traditional work says about language, about its structure, and about its historical development?* This work can never lead to a true conception of what language is and to a real insight into its changes and its historical evolution.

The new discoveries open a window on prehistory by uncovering the hidden life of language. They show the real way in which languages belong together and how they are related, reduce to rubble what have for long been considered as ‘*facts of language*’, including many of those which have been thought of as *firmly rooted for all time*, and radically change our view of ‘*language*’, of its ‘*structure*’, and of its *change and development* in the course of time. In brief, the book is a turning point in the history of linguistics and a line of demarcation between two contradictory periods: *chaos & order, uncertainty & certainty, guesswork & facts*.

I began writing the book around 1981 and it was supposed to be the subject of my Ph.D. dissertation in linguistics at Georgetown University. Professor *Shaligram Shukla*, who was supposed to supervise the dissertation, advised me to look for another topic because this particular subject could be a lifetime research and I might never finish it.

As *the dust of time*, which has been accumulated *layers above layers* over Hamito-Semitic roots, is wiped off, *the fog of millennia*, which has enveloped them in secrecy and obscurity, *is cleared up*, and *the studies and theories*, which have been built upon them since the 8<sup>th</sup> century A. D. with all of their changing winds and shifting sands, are in their entirety proved to be *the product of darkness*, one can see with the bare eyes that every single Hamito-Semitic root, called in the ages of darkness ‘*biliteral root*’, ‘*triliteral root*’, etc., is *a compound or complex word* consisting of a number of meaningful elements *agglutinated* together. Moreover, *every element occurs in a word is also seen in many other words with the same sort of meaning or with a well-defined grammatical function*. Furthermore, *the meaning of the word is the sum total of the meanings of its basic elements*.

As we isolate the basic elements or ‘*proots*’ of the word, we find that *they are present*

*in all languages*, and that there are no families of languages which have completely lost any of such *proots*. In addition, there is *no family of language*, including *Sino-Tibetan*, has completely lost the mechanisms of forming new words by means of ‘*compounding*’ and ‘*derivation*’.

*Chapter I* presents a sketch of Hamito-Semitic language divisions along with the phonological system of their parent tongue as reconstructed by Hamitosemitists.

*Chapter II*, with its *long introduction* and *25 subchapters*, decomposes Hamito-Semitic roots into their component parts, which in turn are traced as far back in time as historical evidence allows, shows clearly that the meaning expressed by any word is *special*, evaluates all *important* views and theories built on such roots from the early 8<sup>th</sup> century to the present, explains thoroughly all linguistic phenomena previously described but unexplained and discovers many new phenomena, appraises all modern theories built on language in modern times, e.g. ‘*deep & surface structure*’, etc., offers a critical review of ‘*borrowing*’ in theory and application, establishes all *unshakable* and *constant* facts of language and its evolution in the course of millennia, presents a brief but suggestive comparative study of *Sino-Tibetan* and *Hamito-Semitic sounds, roots, and grammars* with the purpose of demonstrating that their striking similarities can neither be due to chance nor to borrowing. The elimination of these two implausible explanations opens the way for a hypothesis of genetic relationship. In brief, this Chapter is very broad in scope and deals with *all aspects* of language and linguistics and is so rich in detailed explanations and illustrations, which *I hope will not bore the reader*.

*Chapter III* presents a brief outline of Indo-European language divisions along with the phonological system of their parent tongue as reconstructed by Indoeuropeanists, offers a detailed comparative study of Indo-European and Hamito-Semitic *sounds, words, and grammar*, and establishes *beyond the slightest shadow of doubt* genetic relatedness between them. One may wonder at my using the term ‘*words*’ instead of ‘*roots*’. The fact is that Indo-Europeanists have spent (a better term would be *wasted*) about two centuries reconstructing *compound and complex words* and present them to the world as ‘*roots*’.

In simple words, the differences between Indo-European and Hamito-Semitic families in *proots, words, sounds, and word formation* are similar to those found between any two of such Hamito-Semitic language divisions as *Semitic & Cushitic, Semitic & Chadic*, or any two Indo-European language divisions, e.g. *Hittite & Germanic, Celtic & Balto-Slavic*.

While Indo-European and Hamito-Semitic families share in common the derivational affixes and methods of word formation, I admit that there are *striking similarities* and *marked differences* between them *only* in ‘*inflections*’. The *similarities and differences* are quite natural and fall within the realm of expectation since they manifest two distinct stages of historical developments; *the earlier*, when they had been regional dialects of one common speech (see §3.18 below), *as opposed to later stages*, when they became

separate languages and each began to develop independently. For language ‘stages’, see §2.25 below.

Let me add here that the above-mentioned early ‘*inflectional system*’ is not limited to Indo-European-Hamito-Semitic, but also *found wholly or partly in all world’s languages*, including *Chinese and its sister languages*. For example, the difference between *IE and HS families*, on the one hand, and *a family like Sino-Tibetan*, on the other hand, lies *only* in that IE and HS have many additional morphological endings in common unfound in Sino-Tibetan. This phenomenon will be fully explained in §2.25, n. 9d below.

Finally, *if the relationship between IE and HS is as obvious on all levels of structure as has been described above, one may indeed wonder why all previous attempts to prove their genetic relatedness failed?* It may be sufficient here to cite one simple reason. For *three* other equally weighty reasons, see §2.25 below.

The scholars who attempted to prove the relationship lacked the deep knowledge necessary of either language family *structure* for arriving at a decision. Now, *suppose* that they have ‘*all-embracing knowledge*’ of both families, and that they work jointly with (what we may call) *world’s professional scholars* in either or both fields, the *supposition* does not change the result; *all will absolutely fail because their knowledge of language structure and either language family or both families is severely limited to a particular type of ‘deceptive surface structure’* like that of [band-] above, which is historically the last of *multilayered* structure. The same account perfectly applies to *all other attempts to prove genetic relationships between other families of languages* (§2.25 below).

As you read just ‘*the introduction*’ of Chapter II, you will fully realize that the field of linguistics has always been a *purely virgin land*, and that the writer is the only one to enter into it.

# CHAPTER ONE

## *HAMITO-SEMITIC FAMILY of LANGUAGES*

### **1.1 *Hamito-Semitic Family of languages***

The *Hamito-Semitic* family, also called *Afro-Asiatic*<sup>1</sup> because of its geographic distribution, comprises two groups of languages: *Semitic* and *Hamitic*. Opinions as to the cradle-land of Proto-Hamito-Semitic differ widely. The home has been localized in North Africa, in the Sahara Desert, in Central Arabia, in Babylonia, etc. The consensus of opinion, however, favors *Arabia as the homeland of the Semitic peoples* and *North Africa of the Hamitic peoples*, while the homeland of Proto-Hamito-Semitic is still a controversy. On the other hand, while the Hamito-Semitic family as a whole is widely accepted and well-established, the internal classification of branches and sub-branches within it is still controversial.

The following is an outline of major Hamito-Semitic languages.

**1.1.1 Semitic Languages.** The Semitic languages are a group of closely related languages, traditionally divided into three subgroups: North-East (Akkadian), North-West (Canaanite and Aramaic), and South-West (North Arabic, South Arabic, and Ethiopic).

A deep comparative study between Semitic languages reveals that CA, the youngest

---

<sup>1</sup> The term was coined by Maurice Delafosse in 1914 and is now much more common than the older Hamito-Semitic.

of the Semitic languages in written records, has preserved not only nearly all linguistic forms and features found in individual Semitic languages, but also those found in Old Egyptian. In addition, CA is the only Hamito-Semitic language whose words ‘*explicitly*’ express ‘*special meanings*’, a fact that has a far-reaching effect on our view of language, of its morphological structure, and of its evolution in the course of time.

**1.1.1.1 Akkadian** has a rich literature of inscriptions and clay tablets running from 2800 B.C. to the closing centuries B.C., which make Akkadian the third attested language in the world after *Sumerian* and *Egyptian*. The history of the language has been divided into *Old Akkadian* (or Old Assyrian) from 2800 to 650, and *New Akkadian* (or Babylonian) after 650 B.C. In its oldest form, Akkadian shows considerable linguistic decay, e.g. pharyngeals /ħ/ and /ʕ/, glottal fricative /h/, voiced velar fricative /ɣ/, and glottal stop /ʔ/ fell together as /ʔ/, the confusion of uvular stop /q/ and velar fricative /g/, the reduction of Proto-Semitic distinctive phonemes as /d/, /d̪/, and /ṣ/ into /ṣ/, etc. Similar phenomena of linguistic decay are found in all other Semitic languages, except CA, Ug., and OSA.

**1.1.1.2 Canaanite.** This group includes *Old Canaanite*, *Ugaritic*, *Phoenician*, *Hebrew*, and *Moabite*. *Old Canaanite* is known to us from ‘*Amarna letters*’ found in tell-el-‘*amarna* and date from as early as the 15<sup>th</sup> century, *Ugaritic* from tablets discovered in *Rās Shamra* and date from at least the 14<sup>th</sup> century, and *Phoenician* from numerous inscriptions, the earliest of which are inscriptions of the kings of Byblos and date from the 13<sup>th</sup> century to the 10<sup>th</sup> century B.C. Phoenician died out in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D. Its descendant *Punic* continued to be spoken in North Africa (Carthage) until the 6<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

*Hebrew* is the most important language of this group and the only Canaanite language which has survived as a spoken tongue to the present. *Old Hebrew*, or *Biblical Hebrew*, is the language in which most of *the Old Testament* was written and may be dated between 1200 and 200 century B.C. In addition, there are some short inscriptions of the 9<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C. From about the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C., Aramaic replaced Hebrew as a spoken language, but, despite of this, Hebrew continued to be used as a learned and religious language and it was the language of the *Mishnā*, written in the course of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D., and shows marked linguistic differences from the Old Testament.

*Moabite* is closely related to Hebrew and represented by the inscription of King Mēša’ from the 9<sup>th</sup> century B.C.

**1.1.1.3 Aramaic.** This group falls into *West* and *East Aramaic*. The former group includes Old Aramaic, which is known from inscriptions dating between the 10<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C., Biblical Aramaic, the language of the non-Hebrew part of the Old Testament, dates from the 5<sup>th</sup> century to the 2<sup>nd</sup> B.C., Palmyrene is known from inscriptions running from the 1<sup>st</sup> century B.C. to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century A.D., Nabatian, from the 1<sup>st</sup> century B.C. to the 4<sup>th</sup> century A.D., Palestinian Aramaic was the language spoken at the time of Christ and it was his native tongue. Other Western Aramaic languages are *Judaic Aramaic*, *Samaritan*, and *Christian Palestinian Aramaic*. *Official* or *Imperial Aramaic* is the language used under the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian Empires

from 7<sup>th</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C.

Among East Aramaic languages are Syriac, with a rich literature from the 3<sup>rd</sup> to the 13<sup>th</sup> centuries A.D. and Mandaean or mandaic.

**1.1.1.4 Classical Arabic**, or *North Arabic*, is first known from *Thamūdian*, *Liḥyānian*, and *Ṣafawiyan* (or *Ṣafāyitic*) inscriptions whose dates range from the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C. to the 4<sup>th</sup> century A.D., and from pre-Islamic poetry and later the *Kor'ān* (7<sup>th</sup> century). It is the language of the Kur'ān and the vehicle of one of the greatest literatures of the world. CA is still employed as a literary medium by Arab writers, and *the most essential differences* between Classical Arabic (CA) and Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) are as follows:

a) MSA dictionary includes a large number of words borrowed from foreign languages.

b) Most of MSA words express *abstract meanings* which in CA express *special meanings*.

c) The grammar of MSA is somewhat a simplified version of that of CA.

d) A huge body of CA words and roots are now obsolete. Accordingly, any sizeable MSA dictionary is in the best circumstance no more than a pocket dictionary when compared with a CA dictionary and its inexhaustible vocabulary.

Before the last quarter of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century of Islam, the 1<sup>st</sup> Classical Arabic dictionary, entitled *Al 'Ain*, had been compiled (in 8 volumes) by Khalīl Bin Ahmad Al-Farāhīdī, who arranged it according to the point of articulation, starting with *laryngeals* and ending with *bilabials*, and its grammar, including a comprehensive and accurate description of *phonology* (with its two subsystems: *phonetics* and *phonemics*), *morphology*, and *syntax*, had been written by Al-Farāhīdī's pupil *Sībawayh*, entitled *Al Kitāb*, i.e. *the book*. None of the later brilliant works on Classical Arabic grammar have been able to replace *Al Kitāb*.

**1.1.1.5 Old or Epigraphic South Arabic** (ESA) includes *Minaean*, *Sabaeen*, *Qatabanian*, *Hadramautian*, and *Himyaritic*. They are known from great numbers of inscriptions ranging from the 8<sup>th</sup> century B.C. to the 6<sup>th</sup> century A.D. Modern South Arabic dialects include *Mehri*, *Soqotri*, *Shḥuri*, *Jibbali*, and *Harsusi*.

**1.1.1.6 Ethiopic**, or **Ge'ez**, is first known from *Aksūmite* inscriptions of the 4<sup>th</sup> century A.D., and has a fairly abundant literature from the 5<sup>th</sup> century to the 10<sup>th</sup>. It ceased to be a spoken tongue in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, but is still used as the liturgical language of the Ethiopic Church. Its direct descendants are *Tigrina*, spoken in Northern Ethiopia, and *Tigre*. Among other Ethiopic languages are *Amharic*, the official language of Ethiopia, *Harari*, *Gafat*, *Argobba* and *Gurage*. The last named includes the following dialects: (West) *Chaha*, *Eža*, *Ennemor*, *Gyete*, *Endegn*, *Muher*, *Masqan*, *Gogot*, (East) *Selti*, *Ulbarag*, *Wolane*, and (North) *Aymellel*.

## 1.1.2 Hamitic Languages



The Hamitic languages are traditionally grouped into four subgroups<sup>2</sup>: *Egyptian*, *Berber*, *Cushitic*, and *Chadic*.

**1.1.2.1 Egyptian.** *Egyptian* records extend from 3400 B.C. to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century A.D. The history of the language is divided into Old (3400-2240 B.C.), Middle (2240-1573 B.C.), and New (1573 B.C. to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century A.D.), after the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, the language is called *Coptic*, which became extinct in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, but continued to be used as a religious language.

Egyptian is one of the most important languages of the world for comparative studies. It is almost impossible to carry out such studies *successfully* without knowledge of Egyptian.

The classification of Egyptian as Hamitic is wrong. Apart from phonology, where Egyptian is almost as close to Classical Arabic as Hebrew and Aramaic. As one reads Chapter II, he will fully realize that Egyptian shares with classical Arabic many of the ancient linguistic forms and features, esp. *in proots and morphology*, that had characterized their parent speech. Another fact should be born in mind is that Cushitic, Berber, and Chadic are closer to Classical Arabic than to Egyptian. In the light of all these facts the classification of Egyptian as Hamitic must be abandoned.

**1.1.2.2 Berber or Libyan-Berber.** This Hamitic group is spoken in isolated pockets scattered throughout North Africa and the Sahara desert. Its oldest records are inscriptions dating perhaps from the 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C. and scattered from Sinai to the Canary Islands. Among the Berber languages are Kabyl, Zenaga, Nefusa, Awgila, Ghadames, Twareg, Shilha, Tawlemet, Guanche, and Ahaggar.

**1.1.2.3 Cushitic**, spoken in southern Ethiopia, in the eastern corner of Africa, and in part of the red sea coast. Among the Cushitic languages are *Somali*, *Galla*, *Bedawe*, *Sidamo* (dial. *Kambatta*, *Hadiya*, *Darasa*, etc.), *Agaw*, *Bilin*, *Xamir*, *Xamta*, *Guara*, *'Afar*, *Kaffa*, *Hadiya*, *Walomo*, *Oromo*, *Ometo*, *Gidole*, *Janjero*, *Omotic*, *Iraqw*, *Alagwa*, etc.

**1.1.2.4 Chadic.** This group is spoken in the central part of Chad, Northern Nigeria, Southern Niger, and Northern Cameroons, and includes some 195 languages. Some of such languages are *Housa*, *Angas*, *Bolewa*, *Tangale*, *Ngamo*, *Sura*, *Fyer*, *Dera*, *Pero*, *Mubi*, *Margi*, *Bokkos*, *Tera*, *Karekare*, *Kulere*, *Boghom*, *Sha*, *Bachama*, *Dangla*, *Migama*, *Mofu*, *Mbara*, *Logone*, and *Ankwe*.

### 1.1.3 Proto-Hamito-Semitic Sound System

Proto-Hamito-Semitic sound system is the same as that assumed for Proto-Semitic. It includes the following sounds:

---

<sup>2</sup> Some scholars consider *Omotic* languages a fifth branch of *Hamitic*. Omotic languages, spoken along the Omo river in southern Ethiopia, are considered here a sub-branch of Cushitic.

		Lab.	Interd.	Dental	Pal.	Velar	Uv.	Phar.	Gl. <sup>3</sup>
<i>Stops:</i>	vl.	p (f)		t ṭ		k	ḳ		ʔ
	v.	b		d		g			
<i>Fricatives:</i>	vl.		θ	s ṣ	š	ħ		ḥ	h
	v.		ð ḏ	z		γ		ʕ	
<i>Nasals:</i>		m		n					
<i>Laterals:</i>				l ḏ					
<i>Trill/Flap:</i>				r					
<i>Semivowels:</i>					y	w			
<i>Vowels:</i>	short	i	a	u					
	long	ī	ā	ū					

*Diphthongs:* au (or aw) ai (or ay)

#### 1.1.4 Comments on the Correspondences between Semitic and Egyptian

The following comments are generally limited to the sound correspondences between Egyptian and Semitic<sup>4</sup>, bearing in mind the following facts:

- the precise quality of any speech sound at any given period in the pretape-recording era can never be determined with absolute certainty,
- the interchange of consonants with *the same or similar point of articulation* is quite common in both Semitic and Egyptian. This phenomenon and its causes will be explained in *Chapter II* whenever occasions permit. Accordingly, the emphasis will be on the most frequent sound correspondences between the two language divisions.
- the Sem. and Egyp. cognate words below, *exactly like all of their other words*-traditionally called ‘*roots*’- *are in their entirety compound and complex words*, each consisting of a number of *proots* agglutinated together, as will be shown clearly in *Chapter II*.

##### 1.1.4.1 Stops

- Sem. has two bilabial stops /p, b/, whereas Egyp. has distinct hieroglyphs for two

<sup>3</sup> *Lab.* = bilabial & labiodental, *interd.* = interdental, *pal.* = palatal, *uv.* = uvular, *phar.* = pharyngeal, *gl.* = glottal.

<sup>4</sup> For additional information on sound correspondences between Hamito-Semitic languages, see Vladimir Orel and Olga Stolbova, 1995, Christopher Ehret, 1995, Marcel Cohen 1969, and David Cohen 1970, 1993, 1995.

bilabials /p, b/ and a labiodental /f/; both /p/ and /f/ often interchange and correspond to Sem. /p/.

PHS \*p is /p/ in Akk, Ug., Phoen., Aram.; /f/ in CA, ESA, Eth.; /p, f/ in Egyp., e.g.  
Ug. pth, CA fataḥa “to open” = Egyp. pth id.  
Akk., Aram. prš “to separate”, CA frš “to spread, stretch out” = Egyp. prš “to stretch out”.  
CA faʿfaʿā-ni *arch.* “butcher” = Egyp. fʿ-t “knife”.  
CA fataḥa “to rip, tear, rend” = Egyp. flḫ “to hack in pieces” (~ fdḫ “to rip, cut off, hack” ~ fdk “to cut”)

PHS \*b remained unchanged in Egyp. and Sem., e.g.  
Ug. bt, CA, Heb. byt “house” = Egyp. bʿt id.  
BHeb. bḳḳ “to pour out” = Egyp. bḳbḳ id.

b) Sem. has three dental stops /t, ṭ, d/, whereas Egyp. has distinct hieroglyphs for two /d, t/, which often interchange. Sem. /ṭ/ may correspond to Egyp. /d/ ~ /t/, e.g.  
OAram. tr “door” = Egyp. tryʾ id.  
Ug. ydʿ “to know” = Egyp. ʾdʿy “one who knows”.  
CA CII ḥaṭṭama “to destroy” = Egyp. ḥdm id.  
Akk. ṭabāhu “slaughter” = Egyp. dbḥw id.  
CA ṭamsu “blindness”; ṭāmisu “dark” = Egyp. tms “to cover over”.

PHS \*k and \*ḳ remained stable, while \*/g/ remained unchanged in all except CA, where it became a palatal stop /ḡ/, and has developed differently in modern dialects<sup>5</sup>, e.g.

Heb. kāpār “village” = Egyp. kʿpr id.  
CA ḡurra-tu fem. “frog” = Egyp. ḡrr id.  
CA ḡabūbu “earth, soil, face of the earth” = Egyp. gbb “earth, ground”.

PHS \*ʾ is /ʾ/ in Sem., /y, ʾ/ in Egyp., e.g.  
Sem. ʾab “father” = Egyp. ʾb id.  
CA ʾry “to do, make, work” = Egyp. yr id.  
CA ʾannā *an interrogative* “how, wherever, etc.” = Egyp. yn-nʾ *an interrogative*  
Akk. uḫnu “lapis lazuli”, CA ʾuḫna-tu fem. “house built with *stone*” = Egyp. ykn “a kind of stone”.  
CA šāʾa “to will, want”, in derivatives “ordain, decree, etc.” = Egyp. šʾ “to decree, ordain, determine, predestinate”; šʾ-t “something decreed or ordained by God” = CA ma-šīʾa-tu (+ God) id.

#### 1.1.4.2 Fricatives

<sup>5</sup> It is /g/ (e.g. Egyptian Arabic), /y/ (e.g. Gulf), /ž/ (e.g. Lebanese), /dž/ (e.g. Iraq).

a) Sem. has three interdentalals /θ, ð, ð̣/, while Egyp. has only /θ/, which interchanges with /t/.

PHS \*θ is /θ/ in CA, ESA, and Ug.; /š/ in Akk., Heb., and Phoen.; /s/ in Eth.; /t/ in Aram. In Egyp. /θ/ interchanges with /t/ and with /ð̣/ in some words and with /s/. On the other hand, Egyp. /θ/ may also correspond to Sem. /t/ or to a dental fricative. In all such cases we should reconstruct /θ/, e.g.

Egyp. θ'w “olive”; θ'yty “olive” also “a kind of plant” = Ug. zt (< zyt), Phoen. zyt, etc. gen. Sem. “olive”.

Egyp. θ “thou” ~ t id. = Sem. 'an-ta, -ta, ta- “thou”.

Egyp. θr-t “willow tree” = CA sarwu coll. id.

Egyp. θ'rtý “bread made of fine flour” = Heb., BAram. slt “fine meal, flour”, CA sultu “a kind of wheat, white barley”.

In some cases, Sem. /θ/ is /s/ in Egyp. as in CA θalġu “snow”, Heb. šlg id. = Egyp. s'rġw id.

PHS \*ð is /ð̣/ in CA and ESA; /ð, d/ in Ug.; /z/ in Akk., Phoen., Heb., and Eth.; /d/ in Aram., and /d/ in Egyp., e.g.

Akk. zību “wolf”, CA ði'bu, Heb. z'b, Aram. d'b, Eth. ze'b = Egyp. dyb (~ sy'b) id.

CA ðaffa “to hasten” = Egyp. dfn id.

PHS \*ð̣ is /ð̣/ in CA, Ug.<sup>6</sup>, and ESA; /š/ in Akk., Phoen., Heb. and Eth.; /ṭ/ in Aram.; /ð̣/ in Egyp. which interchanges with /d, t/, e.g.

CA ðubba-tu “blade of sword, pointed edge of a spear, of a dagger” = Egyp. ðb “spear, javelin, harpoon”.

CA ðami'a “be thirsty”, Heb. šm', Eth. ṭm' = Egyp. ðm' “dry land, parched ground”.

Akk. uššu “arrow”, Ug. ḥð id. = Egyp. ḥð-t “spear”.

CA ða'mu “brother-in-law” = Egyp. d'm “young man”.

CA naðara “to see” = Egyp. ndr “eye”.

b) Sem. has three dentals /s, z, š/, while Egyp. has distinct hieroglyphs for two interchangeable consonants, which could be /s, z/. By Middle Egyp. they had become fused.

PHS \*s is /s/ in Sem.; /š, s/ in Egyp., e.g.

Akk. saħhu “meadow” = Egyp. sh-t “field, meadow”.

PHS \*z is /z/ in Sem.; /s/ in Egyp., e.g.

CA zahhu “haste, rapidity”; zahha “to hurry, hasten” = Egyp. shsh “to flee”; shw-

---

<sup>6</sup> The Ug. corresponding consonant to /ð̣/, the emphatic counterpart of /ð/, is represented by Semitists with /ṭ/ and classified as a voiceless aspirate /ṭ<sup>h</sup>/ (cf. O'Leary, 1969: 56-58). We have no way of knowing why it is a 'voiceless aspirate', since Semitists do not explain.

t “a hastening”.

Sem. /z/, like /š/ below, is in many words from an earlier /d/, e.g.

CA ‘azara “to help, assist”, BHeb. ‘āzar “to hel, aid”; ‘ēzer “help” = Egyp. ‘ḏr “help, assistance”.

PHS \*š is /š/ in Sem.; /ḏ/ in Egyp, e.g.

CA šabāya, Heb. šābā’ “to dye” = Egyp. ḏb’gí “to dip, immerse”. The difference in meaning between CA šabāya and dabāya lies in the *object* to be dyed.

CA ša’aḳa, Heb. šā’aḳ “to cry out” = Egyp. ḏ’k id.

CA šarra “to tie up, wrap”, Heb., Aram. šrr “to bind, wrap up” = Egyp. ḏr “to tie up, bandage, envelop”.

CA šara’a “to kill, to smite to the earth, strike”, Heb. šāra’ “to smite heavily, strike” = Egyp. ḏr’ “to smite to the earth, strike”.

Ug. ušb’, CA, Heb. šb’ “finger” = Egyp. ḏb’ id.

Proto-Sem. /š/ has a number of different origins, one of which is PHS /ḏ/, another is /š/, a third is /d/. These will be explained and illustrated fully in Chapter II.

PHS \*š is /s/ in CA; /s/ in ESA; /š/ in all other Sem. languages; /š, s/ in Egyp., e.g.

CA, Eth. ḥsb Heb. ḥšb “compter” = Egyp. ḥsb id.

CA sawtu, Heb. šwt “whip” = Egyp. š’d id.

CA sāḳu, Heb. šwḳ “leg” = Egyp. sbḳ id.

CA šaiyiḳu “filled with yearning desire, desirable” = Egyp. š’ḳīḳ “to delight in”.

A consonant /š/ is found in South Arabic represented with /s<sup>2</sup>/, in Heb. with ש, i.e., *the symbol for ש /š/ and a diacritic mark*, and in Aram. dialects with /s/. The attribution of this consonant to PSem. is debatable (cf. Moscati, 1969: 8.29). It interchanges with /š/ and /s/ in BHeb.<sup>7</sup> and corresponds to /š/ in OArām. and all other Semitic languages, i.e.

Heb. ‘śr, Sab. ‘s<sup>2</sup>r “ten” = Akk. ‘ešri “ten”, CA, Eth. ‘ašru, OArām. ‘śr id.

Sab. s<sup>2</sup>ms<sup>1</sup> “sun”, but Heb. šmš, Ug. špš, OArām, Phoen. šmš, Akk. šamsu, CA šamsu id.

Akk. šaptu “lip”, CA šapa-tu, Egyp. sp-t id.

CA šimāl “the left (hand)”, Heb. śml, Egyp. smr “the left hand”.

The possibility that /š/ is a phoneme will be entertained in §3.10.49, under *Comments* below.

There is still another consonant /ḥ/ found only in Egyp. and represented with a distinct hieroglyph. This Egyp. consonant interchanges with /š/ and /h/ in many words and corresponds in many words to Sem. /h/ and /š/, e.g.

Egyp. ḥmm “to smell” = CA šamma id. Egyp. also has ḥmd “to smell”, this is from earlier ḥmm-t “a smell” (= CA šamma-tu id.)<sup>8</sup>.

Egyp. ḥn “to be sick, to trouble, be disturbed internally”; ḥnn “nausea” = ḥn “to

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, §2.2.55, ft 1, under *Comments* below.

<sup>8</sup> CA ḥamma “become stinky, give a bad smell”.

disturb, stir up trouble” = Egyp. šn “nausea, trouble; sickness, illness” = CA šannu “be physically weak, emaciated, hungry”; šanū’a-tu “feeling nausea, feeling sick”.

Egyp. hn “hide, skin, water-skin, leather bottle” = CA šannu “any worn-out receptable or vessel made from hide, water-skin”.

Egyp. hrt “the mole-god” = CA huld “mole”.

Egyp. h’d, h’rd “boy, child” = CA haudu “pretty young girl”, harūdu “virgin girl”.

We may include here examples involving metathesis as

a) Egyp. hfd “to steal, plunder” = Akk. habātu “to plunder”, Heb. htp id. CA htf “to kidnap”.

b) Egyp. ‘nh “to live” = CA na’aša “enliven” (§2.11.15 below).

PHS \*h is /h/ in Akk, Ug., CA and ESA; /ħ/ in Phoen., Heb. and Aram.; /h/ in Egyp., e.g.

CA harra “to kneel down, fall to the ground” = Egyp. hr “to fall to the ground”.

Akk. haṭṭu “trunk, branch” = Egyp. ht “wood, tree, branch”.

PHS \*γ is /γ/ in Ug., CA, and ESA; /ʾ/ in Akk.; /ʾ/ in Phoen., Heb. and Aram.; /ʾ/ in Egyp., e.g.

CA γannā, Heb. ‘ānā = Egyp. ‘nn “to sing”.

CA γurru “jaw-bone, mandible” = Egyp. ‘r-t “the lower jaw, jaw-bone”.

PHS \*ḥ is /ħ/ in Ug., CA, ESA, Phoen., Heb., Aram. and Eth.; /ʾ/ in Akk.; /ħ/ in Egyp.

CA ḥubbu “love” = Egyp. ḥb “rejoicing”.

CA swḥ = Egyp šwḥ “to journey, travel”.

PHS \*‘ is /ʾ/ in Ug., CA, ESA, Phoen., Heb., Aram. and Eth.; /ʾ/ in Akk.; /ʾ, ʾ/ in Egyp., e.g.

Ug. ḏr’ “upper arm”, CA širā’u “arm”, = Egyp. ḏr’-t “hand”.

CA ‘arasu “astonishment”; ‘arisa “be amazed, astonished” = Egyp. ‘rš “be amazed, stupefied”.

PHS \*h is /h/ in Ug., CA, ESA, Phoen., Heb., Aram., and Eth.; /ʾ/ in Akk.; /h/ in Egyp.

BHeb. hāwā “to fall, ruin”, CA hawā “to fall, fall down” = Egyp. hw “to fall, to descend”.

BHeb. hmh “to hum, growl”, CA hamhama “to hum, roar” = Egyp. hmhm “to roar, bellow”.

### 1.1.4.3 *Nasals*

a) PHS \*m and \*n remained unchanged in Sem. and Egyp., e.g.

CA mannā “to remain” also “be strong, firm” = Egyp. mn “remain”; mnw “firm”.

CA mara’a “to see” = Egyp. mr id.

CA nāma, BHeb., Eth. nwm “to sleep” = Egyp. nm id.

#### 1.1.4.4 *Laterals*

PHS \*l is /l/ in Sem., but in Egyp. l, r, n, e.g.

CA lisānu “tongue” = Egyp. ns, ls id.

CA ḥalla-tu “low-lying land” = Egyp. ḥrw, ḥlw id.

Akk. ailu “buck”, Phoen., Ug. ’yl “buck, deer”, CA ’yl “stag, deer” = Egyp. ’īr “stag”.

PHS \*ḏ is /ḏ/ in CA, ESA, and Eth.; /ṣ/ in Akk., Ug., Phoen., Heb.; /ʾ/ in Aram; in Egyp. /ḏ/, which often interchanges with /d/, e.g.

CA ḥaḏa’a “flame up a fire” = Egyp. ḥḏ “become bright, illumine”.

CA ’uḏwu = Egyp. ’dī “member”.

CA ḏaw’u “light (sunlight, daylight); mu-ḏī’u “luminous, giving light” = Egyp. dw’ “the morning”, dw’īt “the dawn, the early morning”.

Hamito-Semiticists consider Egyp. /ḏ/ as being equivalent to Sem. /g/ in few words, e.g.

Egyp. ḏnh “wing” = CA ḡanāḥ id. Such two words *could be ‘distant cognates’*. To understand what is meant by ‘distant cognates’, see §2.1.13, n. 4 below. For CA [ga-], see §2.17.83 below and for -nāḥ “side”, see §2.2.51 below.

#### 1.1.4.5 *r-sound*

PHS \*r is /r/ in Sem.; /r/ in Egyp., e.g.

OAram. ḥr “master”, CA ḥurru “nobleman” = Egyp. ḥr “master”.

#### 1.1.4.6 *Semivowels*

The two semivowels are preserved intact in CA; any change or interchange of /w, y/ in *derivatives* is subject to rules that admit no exceptions. In Ug., Phoen., Aram., and Heb., initial /w-/ usually became /y-/; in Sabaeen and Minaean /w-/ sometimes became /y-/ . Sem. /w/ = Egyp. /w, y/ and Sem. /y/ = Egyp. /ʾ, y/. e.g.

CA wahā, ta-wahhā = Egyp. wh’ “to seek”.

Akk. (w)šābu “to sit”, Phoen., OAram., Heb. yšb, Ug. yθb, ESA wθb id., CA waḥaba expresses both “to sit” and “to rise” = Egyp. ysb-t “seat”.

Akk. šāu, CA šawā “roast” = Egyp. šw dry.

#### 1.1.5 *Comments on Vowel Changes*

The major vocalic changes in daughter languages are as follows:

The vowel system has been preserved intact only in CA. Moscati (1969: §8.68) finds that

*«The Proto-Semitic vowel system has an exact reflection of Arabic whose full network of graphic symbols mirrors the phonemic position. The history of Arabic and its dialects shows clearly in what manner vowels of other timbres have evolved in the Semitic*

*languages and have, in the course of time, acquired phonemic status».*

Gardiner (EG, 3) sees that

*«The entire vocal system of Old Egyptian may indeed proved to have reached a stage resembling that of Hebrew or modern Arabic as compared with classical Arabic».*

Akkadian and Old Canaanite have a vowel system similar to that of CA, but with the addition of short and long /e/, which developed from short and long /a, i/. However, in Old Bab. /i/ occurs so frequently for /e/ (cf. Moscati, op.cit: §8.70). This may suggest that /e/ is an innovation. A parallel development is noted in Arabic dialects, e.g. CA *banāt* “girls” > *banēt*, CA *bāb* “door” > *bēb*, bait “home” > *bēt*, *‘alīm* “knowledgeable” > *‘alēm*, *‘anā* > *‘anē* (or *‘anī* in some dialects like SL)<sup>9</sup>, *bin* “son” as in *bin ‘alī* “Ali’s son” > *ben ‘alē*, etc.

Moscati (op.cit: §8.75) finds that Ug. /’/ has three symbols according to the vowel which follows, i.e. *i/ī*, *a/ā*, *u/ū*. He tends to infer that *«the Ugaritic vowel-system corresponds substantially to that of Proto-Semitic».*

All other Semitic languages have developed a number of additional vowels, esp. /e, o, ə/.

### 1.1.6 Diphthongs

Classical Arabic *«preserves the diphthongs in their entirety»* (Moscati, 1969: §8.102). In other Semitic languages the two diphthongs /aw/ and /ay/ underwent various modifications. In Akk. they became /ū/ and /ī/ respectively, while in phoen. and Heb. they became /ō/ and /ē/ respectively. In some cases, the diphthongs remained unchanged in Heb. Aram., Eth., etc. (cf. O’Leary, 1969: §§49-50; Moscati, op.cit: §§8.97-8.104).

a) CA *baitu* “house”, Akk. *bītu*, Assy. *bētu*, Heb. *bayit*, *bēt*, Aram. *baitā*, Eth. *bēt* id.

b) CA masc. *lailu*, fem. *lailatu* “night”, Akk. *līlāt*, Heb. *lailāh*, Aram. *lelyā*, Eth. *lēlīt* id.

c) CA *θauru* “bull”, Akk. *šūru*, Heb. *šōr*, Aram. (Palm.) *tōrā*, Eth. *sōr* id.: Ugr. *θr*.

d) CA *mautu* “death”, Akk. *mūtu*, Heb. *māwet*, Aram. *mautā*, Eth. *mōt* id.

---

<sup>9</sup> Such changes are not confined to modern dialects, but also found in Old dialects, and were first described in the 8<sup>th</sup> century and explained in terms of the phonological environments that may or may not permit the changes. Similarly, dialectal /o/ is from /u/ as in *murr* “bitter” > *morr*, while /ō/ is from /ū/ and /au/ as in *‘āmūd* “pillar” > *‘āmōd* and *lauḥ* “board” > *lōḥ*.



## CHAPTER TWO

### HAMITO-SEMITIC ROOT STRUCTURE

#### 2.1 Introduction

One of the most notable features of the Hamito-Semitic family is the form of the root, which is purely consonantal. The basic lexical meaning of a word lies in the radical consonants. The vowels show only modifications of the root meaning and are generally not written<sup>10</sup>. A typical example may be the CA root [ktb] كتب “write”, which may be read *kataba* “he wrote”, *kutiba* “it was written”, *katbu* “writing”, or *kutubu* “books” as the text seems to require. As one may note, vowels interlocked with the radical consonants serve to express only shades of meaning without changing the basic idea connoted by the root.

The oldest Egyptian texts, from the fourth millennium B.C., are similarly written in a system that does not indicate vowels. On this particular point, Gardiner (EG, 2) writes:

*«Egyptian shares the principle peculiarity of Semitic in that its word-stems consist of combinations of consonants, as a rule three in number, which are theoretically at least unchangeable. Grammatical inflection and minor variations of meaning are contrived mainly by ringing the changes on the internal vowels, though affixed endings also are used for the same purpose...»*

Although Hamito-Semitic language groups generally agree on the radical consonants as the carrier of meaning, they nonetheless disagree on the number of those radicals. The

---

<sup>10</sup> Nearly all Semitic languages employ scripts that express consonants only. The vocalic symbols of Arabic, Hebrew, and Syriac were introduced in the 8<sup>th</sup> century.

root, for example, is of two radicals in Cushitic, very frequently so in Egyptian, Chadic, and Berber, but predominantly of three in Semitic. The following examples of root correspondences between Semitic and Hamitic (Cushitic and Egyptian) may illustrate this disagreement:

### 2.1.1 *Semitic and Cushitic*

- a) Semitic *ḳtl* “to kill” (OAram., CA *ḳtl* id.)  
Cush. *ḳl* “to kill” (Ga. *ḳala* id);
- b) Semitic *pʿl* “to make” (CA *pʿl* id.)  
Cush. *pl* “to make” (Som. *faḷ* “to do”);
- c) Semitic *ḏnb* “tail” (CA, Ug. *ḏnb* id.)  
Cush. *db* “tail” (Ga. *dubo*, Som. *dib* id.);
- d) Semitic *msk* “to mix” (Ug. *msk* id.)  
Cush. *mk* “to mix” (Ga. *maka* id.);
- e) Semitic *ʾgn* “bowl, basin, vase” (Akk. *ʾgn*, CA *ʾġn* id.)  
Cush. *gn* “jar” (Ag., Af., Ga. *gān* id.);
- f) Semitic *ḳbḏ* “to seize, take, hold” (CA *ḳbḏ*, Heb. *ḳbš* id.)  
Cush.: *ḳb* “to take, take hold of” (Ga., Som. *ḳab*, Ag., Bil. *gab*, Sa., Af. *kab*);
- g) Semitic *kl* “all, entire, each, every” (Akk., Phoen., CA *kl* id.)  
Cush.: *-k* “all, every” (Bed. *-ak*, Ag., Bil., Ch. *-k*, De, Qu. *-kī* id.). A similar form is also noted in Berb: cf. To. *ak* “every”, Kab. *ako* “all” (VPHS, 115).

### 2.1.2 *Semitic and Egyptian*

- a) Semitic *pʿs* “fire” (CA *pʿs* id.)  
Egyp. *pʿ* “fire”;
- b) Semitic *ḳrn* “horn” (Akk., CA, Heb. *ḳrn* id.)  
Egyp. *ḳr* “horn”;
- c) Semitic *ḥḏʾ* “to light, kindle” (CA *ḥḏʾ* id.)  
Egyp. *ḥḏ* “to illumine, shine”;
- d) Semitic *ḏpn* “to beat with the feet” (CA *ḏfn* id.)  
Egyp. *ḏḏḏf*, with reduplication, “to patter with the feet”;
- e) Semitic *ʾpr* “dust, soil” (Aram. *ʾpr* “land, dust”, CA *ʾfr* “dust”)  
Egyp. *ʾpʾp*, with reduplication, “earth, ground”;
- f) Semitic *ʾyr* “ass” (Ug. *ʾr*, CA *ʾyr* id.)  
Egyp. *ʾy* “ass”.

The examples set forth above show clearly that Semitic and Hamitic cognate roots have two different phonological structures; *the root in Semitic is of three radical consonants, while in Hamitic of two*. This notable difference would naturally suggest that either (a) *one of the Semitic radicals, missing from the Hamitic cognate, is a later development*, or (b) *the Hamitic cognate has simply lost a radical through some sort of phonological change*. Without a solution of this problem the reconstruction of Proto-Hamito-Semitic roots is virtually impossible, and without such reconstruction we have no adequate method for a scientific comparative study of Hamito-Semitic language

family and other languages and language families such as Indo-European, Sino-Tibetan, Sumerian, etc.

### 2.1.3 *Critical Review of Some works on Hamito-Semitic*

At this point, a question naturally arises: *Which form of the root can be taken as a representative of the earlier stages as opposed to the later stages of the Hamito-Semitic root system, the Hamitic or the Semitic form?*

Before the beginning of the second decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the prevalent belief among scholars was that all Semitic roots were of three radicals, and that such common Semitic biliteral roots like [ʾab] “father” and [bin] “son” were assumed to have been the product of linguistic decay: ʾab has developed from [ʾbw] and bin from [bny].

At that time, the same view also held true of the biliteral roots found in Egyptian and other Hamitic languages, which were believed to have arisen from original trilateral roots that had been worn down or shortened in the course of time. Gardiner (EG, §273), for instance, clearly expresses this view:

*«As in Semitic languages, the typical verb-stem (of Old Egyptian) consists of three radical consonants, ex. sḏm “hear”. There existed, however, a considerable class of biliteral stems, ex. mn “remain”, “endure”, though it may be shown that many of these originally belonged to one or other of the classes with three consonants, such as wḏ “command”, Arabic وصي (waṣiya), tm “be closed”, Arabic تم (tamma). Whereas the verbs just quoted had, owing to some inherent weakness, passed in prehistoric times from the triconsonantal to the biconsonantal class, there are other apparently biliteral stems, such as m(w)t “die”, which prove on closer inspection to the really trilaterals».*

But the study that has since been made on Hamitic roots has demonstrated that such roots were truly biliteral. Between then and now numerous attempts have been made by scholars working on Semitic languages to prove that the Semitic trilateral system was developed from an older biliteral one<sup>11</sup>. However, the kind of evidence proposed by such scholars in support of the hypothesis is largely based on the common observation that *«there are many groups of roots having the first two radicals in common which express identical or similar meanings»* (Moscatti, 1969: §11.5), such as those beginning with [gz-], [pr-], etc. see §§2.1.8.1-2.1.9.4 below, and that, in accordance with this observation, Semitic trilateral roots are bound to be derived from such two radicals. Vycichl (1975: 205-206) finds that the same observation also holds true for Hamitic and he writes:

*«It is a well known fact that Semitic -and even Hamitic- roots of similar meaning often share the first and second radical as a basic element from which triconsonantal roots are derived ḵbb, ḵbḥ “to be cool”. Hitherto, investigations have concentrated on the first*

---

<sup>11</sup> Hurwitz 1966; Duminiki, 1937; Diamond, 1965: Chaps 18, 19; Diakonof, 1965: 29ff; Gray, 1971:34-36; Moscatti 1964:72-75, Vycichl, 1975: 201-212, Ehret, 1995: Appendix I, etc.

*biconsonantal group and a great number of such groups have been identified the meaning of which is beyond doubt. The unknown factor, viz. the third radical, has never been the object of an exhaustive investigation».*

It is to be born in mind, however, that such scholars have never put forth a scientifically consistent method to explain how the older biliteral root has developed into its present trilateral form or to determine the function or meaning of the third radical. A scientific study and evaluation of the observation in question is given in §§2.1.8.1-2.1.9.4 below.

1) Besides drawing attention to the observation just mentioned above, Hurwitz (1966), like some other Semitists, gives an additional attempt to determine a third radical or what he calls ‘a root-determinative’ in the Semitic trilateral root by selecting a small number of roots from Assyrian, Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, and Ethiopic, and focusing on each language separately. The following examples in which Hurwitz attempts to locate precisely the root determinative in the Assyrian trilateral [’zb] and Aramaic [pr’] in (a) & (b) below are a perfect sample illustrating not only his own approach to the subject, but also that of other Semitists. My comments on Hurwitz’s views will be confined to surface structure of each trilateral.

a) Hurwitz writes:

«זָבּ, *ezebu* “to make to go one’s way, forsake, let”. √zb “to go, flow”; cf. זָוַב (*zwb*), *zābu* “to flow, melt”; Aramaic זָבַב (*šzb*) “to free, deliver”; Hebrew זָבַח (*’zb*) “to forsake, let go free”» (p. 93).

Hurwitz derives [’zb] from a root \*zb “to go, to flow” and considers Assy. [zwb] a derivative of \*zb without troubling himself to explain the obvious phonological difference between \*zb and [zwb]. Hurwitz’s subjective point of view raises the question: *Why is it that Assy. [’zb] is from \*zb and not, for example, from \*’z- or \*zw-? Is there anything (like cause, reason, evidence, etc.) on earth that approves one possibility and disapproves another? Assuming for the moment that the trilateral is from \*zb, in this case: What is the function or meaning of \*’- in Assy.? Is it a derivational prefix? Is it an inflectional prefix? Is it a particle? In brief, what is it?*

Furthermore, He connects Aramaic [šzb] with Assyrian [’zb] and Hebrew [’zb] and apparently considers both /š-/ and /’-/ as prefixes, but without determining the difference in meaning or function between them.

As for the above-mentioned triliterals by Hurwitz, Assy. *ezēbu* “to leave, abandon”, Oakk. ’zb “to leave” (Gelb, 1961: 183) = Hebrew ’āzab “to leave, to forsake” also “to abandon, to desert, as *houses or cities*” = CA ’azaba “to depart, go away, be distant from” also “to desert, as a land, family” (OT, 764-765), SL ’azab expresses “to depart or go away from one’s home, friends, family, etc., to keep oneself distant from home, people, etc.”. For Assy. [zwb] = CA *ḏwb*, etc. see §§2.3.33-2.3.34 below, and Aramaic [šzb] = CA *šaḏaba* “turn away from a thing, push away” as in Poet:

«na-šḏubu ‘an Khindafin ḥattā tarda».

The verbal form *na-šḏubu* = *we push away Khindaf’s enemy or we free Khindaf from his enemy*. The most common meaning of *šaḏaba* throughout the history of the language

has been “to prune a tree, i.e. *to cut off dead or unnecessary branches*. In other words, *to free or deliver* a tree from such branches, etc. (LA). For Semitic [šḏb], see §2.2.40 below.

b) Another example cited by Hurwitz is the following:

«Aramaic פער [pʿr] “to uncover”. √pr “to cleave apart”; cf. (Aramaic) פרע [prʿ] “to open, uncover”; פרר [pr̄r] “to cleave apart”» (Hurwitz, 1966: 87).

It seems evident that Hurwitz considers Aramaic [pʿr] and [prʿ] variants of one form, which is ultimately a biradical √pr. He treats the voiced pharyngeal /ʿ/ as an affix, but without determining its grammatical function or meaning.

The naked fact is that Aramaic [pʿr] and [prʿ] are two unrelated trilaterals and their surface etymologies are as follows:

i) Aramaic [pʿr] is from \*pʿr as in BHeb. pāʿar “to open wide, to gape”, Syr. pʿr id. (OT, 860) = CA fayara id.

ii) Aramaic [prʿ] is from \*prʿ as in BHeb. pāraʿ “to uncover, make naked, by loosening the garments, etc., e.g. *the head*”, BAram., Talm. prʿ id. (OT, 868) = SL farraʿ “make naked (of some of one’s clothes, esp. *one covering the head-hair*”; m-farriʿ adj. “uncovered” < CA frʿ (§2.1.10 below).

2) Ehret (1995: Appendix 1) works on groups of CA kindred trilaterals in an attempt to locate the third radical and determine its grammatical function as the following examples show:

<i>Forms in Arabic</i>	<i>Extension (or suffix)</i>
baht “to surprise and seize”	*t durative (p. 493)
bahr “astonishment”	*r noun suffix (p. 493)
ḥadb “to dye (specially red)”	*pʿ finite fortative (p. 503)
ḥalġ “to draw, attract”	*gʷ durative (p. 503)
ḥalġ “to tear out”	*gʷ finite fortative (p. 503)
rauḥ “to go away, depart”	*ḥ iterative (p. 516)
raud “to come and go, go to and fro, roam about, move to and fro; shift”	*d durative (p. 516)
raus “to step along haughtily”	*sʿ fortative (p. 516)
rauṭ “to flee into the mountains and dunes”	*tʿ durative intensive (p. 516)
rais “to walk pompously with violent movements of the body”	*sʿ fortative (p. 516)
raih “to come and go”	*h amplificative (p. 516).
ḥaḏf “to cut off part of one’s hair”	*f iterative (p. 518), etc.

Ehret consistently divides the trilateral into a root consisting of the first two radicals and a suffix expressing one of such *rhyming* and *impressive* terms as ‘durative’, ‘iterative’, ‘fortative’, ‘partative’, ‘extendative’, ‘incoative’, and so forth, and in so doing, he rules out the possibility that a third radical may be a prefix, infix, or root. However, Ehret does not explain the criterion he uses for separating ‘the suffix’ from ‘the root’. Nor does he tell why the third radical is always a suffix and not, for example, a prefix or a root. Much more important by far than what we have just mentioned is the

fact that Ehret, like any other Semitist, overlooks two important facts in his study of Semitic root: (a) *a Semitic triliteral very often expresses a number of unrelated root meanings*, and (b) *the oldest known meaning of the word*.

For example, the meaning assigned to CA *rauḥ* [r. rwḥ] above is current in MSA and found in all modern Arabic dictionaries. The meaning of the word in CA dictionaries and pre-Islamic literature, however, is wholly centered on ‘sunset’, hence “to go away or depart after *sunset*”. Accordingly, the core meaning of the word is ‘sunset’ and it is, therefore, impossible to study scientifically the root without basing the study on ‘sunset’. For a deep study of this complex triliteral in Hamito-Semitic, see §2.13.24 below. The same three radicals also express in CA, among others, “rest” (in sisters languages with initial /n-/ instead of /r-/) and in CA and all its sisters “soul”, etc.

To give another example, the original meaning of *raud* [rwd] above is not “to come and go, etc.” as in MSA, but rather “one who precedes the tribe to search for water and pasture”<sup>12</sup> (LA), and from this complex semantic notion all meanings cited above and so many others have been derived.

Once you discover the complex semantic content of a root, of course after a deep study of its cognates in related languages, you will see with a bare eye that the root is a compound of a number of morphological elements, you will realize how systematically and regularly a language changes and evolves in the course of time, and you will be surprised, if not shocked, to find very large numbers of HS different triliterals are intimately related to the root you have just discovered. *Can one believe the mere fact that phonemically different roots expressing widely divergent meanings like [rwḥ], [ṣbḥ], [ṣḥ], [brḥ], [bwḥ], [dnḥ], [wḥy], [lwḥ], [ṣwḥ], [ḏbḥ], [ḏḥ], [ḏḥy], etc. are all based on proot [-ḥaW-] (see §2.13.24 below).*

3) The fact is that *every single triliteral in Semitic is a complex entity of a number of roots and/or grammatical affixes combined together to express a number of corresponding special meanings* (see §2.1.10 below), and that, scientifically speaking, to study any Semitic triliteral root one has first to determine precisely the elements of the complex triliteral and then bring back to the root (i.e. *reconstruct*), whenever needed, all bound morphological elements which have been lost in the course of time as a result of phonological changes. These cannot, of course, be done without knowledge of its complex morphological and semantic structures. For example, HS [dkk] “pound, crush, destroy”, *like all other roots in Hamito-Semitic languages without any exception*, is originally a mere word *dak-* consisting of a number of free morphemes agglutinated together (see §2.1.6.5.1 below). As a matter of fact, the sounds or syllables which this word has lost in the course of time since PHS as a result of sound change outnumber those which have been kept. Accordingly, both the word *dak-* and the root [dkk] represent *the final and most refined stage of development*. For the original compound form, see §2.1.6.5.1 below.

Since all of those who have worked on Semitic or Hamito-Semitic roots have neither been aware of the morphological complexity of the root nor of the nature of its meaning,

---

<sup>12</sup> This has become MSA *raud* “pioneering”; *rā'id* “pioneer”, as a vb *rāda*.

which is the sum total of the meanings of its elements, it can thus be said that *they have been truly dealing with the wrong subject, that all what they have written on this subject since the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century have been nothing but a waste of page and of ink, and that any view, assumption, or theory they have built or expressed on any Semitic word or root is unquestionably ‘wrong’ and ‘groundless’*.

4) Instead of elaborating on the differences between my study and other studies that have been done on Semitic languages as a group or as individual languages from the 8<sup>th</sup> century to the present, I prefer, for the sake of *brevity* and *clarity*, to say a few words on this matter.

The present work meets two indispensable requirements for a strict scientific study, namely ‘*explanation*’ and ‘*evidence*’. Every word we write is carefully thought out, based on evidence and guided by reason and rationality, every linguistic feature we deal with is lucidly explained, and all cognates are carefully selected after an in-depth study of all historical facts available about them. As for other studies, they are all at war with ‘*explanation*’ and ‘*evidence*’ and replete with hypotheses in conflict with facts, with assumptions based on the whim and free-reined imagination, with views in harmony with darkness, and with theories having no legs to stand on.

As a matter of fact, the only thing in common between this work and any other modern work on this subject is just the term ‘*Semitic*’ (or *Hamito-Semitic* ~ *Afro-Asiatic*) and nothing else *at all*. From here, my reconstruction of Proto-Hamito-Semitic grammar is completely different from anything done on this matter *in form, in essence, in content, and in methodology of research*.

5) Orel and Stolbovo (HSED, 473) reconstruct PHS \*’amas- “darkness, evening”, for example, on the basis that the form is found in some Chushitic languages (HSED, n. 38). In fact, this is not a root, but a complex word consisting of a number of *free* and *bound morphemes*, the most obvious of which are two: [’a-] = a derivative prefix and *musyu* “evening, darkness”. For the ultimate origin of the compound [musyu], see §3.10.13 below. In addition, the complex word signifies “yesterday” as in CA ’amsu id., a derivative of root [msy]. Moreover, the CA word is not a *direct* cognate of Akk. *mūšu* “night” as they propose; the exact cognate is CA *musyu*. As for Akk. *amšali* “yesterday”, which they cite for no reason since they do not explain its final /-l-/. It is the genuine and true cognate form of CA ’amsu above, and its final [-l] is originally a free morpheme signifying “ago, afore”: see §2.17.15 below.

This is, however, not all. They impose the sound systems and forms of languages with a very short written tradition, like Chadic and Cushitic, upon Proto-Semitic and Old Egyptian as if such languages have never changed in this respect since the time of Proto-Hamito-Semitic<sup>13</sup>, e.g. PSem. \*h of [nwh] (Akk. *nāhu*, etc. gen. Sem.) “rest” is from PHS \*k simply because some Chadic dialects have a form *nook* “rest” (HSED, n. 1907), and PSem. \*šaman- (Akk. *šamanu*, etc. gen. Sem. id.) is bound to be from PHS \*siman- “oil, fat” on the account that some Chadic dialects have initial /s/ and perhaps an /-i-/ in

<sup>13</sup> Some scholars place Proto-Hamito-Semitic as far back as 12000 years ago.

the 1<sup>st</sup> syllable: cf. Diri *sinama* “oil” (HSED, n. 2247).

They trace P<sup>Sem.</sup> \*ʾḏb “be sweet”, as in CA ʾaḏuba “be sweet (water)” with extreme boldness and unstrained fancy to a PHS \*ʾvʒimb- (v = *unidentified vowel*) because a Chadic language called Migama has a word ʒimbe “honey, bee” (HSED, n. 1146), and Old Egypt. ḥnn “hoe” to PHS \*ḳul- (?) because a form kul “hoe” is found in some Chadic languages (HSED, n. 2049).

6) Similarly, Ehret’s reconstruction of Afro-Asiatic (1995) is based on Cushitic, Chadic and Omotic. Any P<sup>Sem.</sup>, even pre-P<sup>Sem.</sup> (*as he often refers to*), or Old Egyptian linguistic element or form (e.g. *vowel, consonant, etc., trilateral, derivative, etc., signification of a form, etc.*) is generally modified and remodeled to fit its supposed corresponding feature or form in any of the just mentioned Hamitic languages. Some illustrative examples are:

a) Sem. šakan- “to dwell” (Akk. šakānu, Ug. škn) is from PHS \*suk- as in Cush. suk “to sit”, Omotic: Majoid sok “to sleep” (n. 214).

b) Egyptian bḥn “to bark” is from PHS \*baaḥ- “voice” as in Proto-Southern Cushitic \*baaḥ “to shout” and Chad. ba (?) “mouth” (n. 7).

c) Sem. barm- “to twist a rope tight” (CA barama id., Akk. barāmu “to weave colored threads”) is from PHS \*pʾār “to twist, esp. *a rope*” as in Proto-Southern Cushitic pʾār “to make rope, string” (n. 112).

One may note that Sem. and Egypt. /b/ may be from /b/ (n. b above) or from /p/ (n. c above) depending on the supposed Cush. or Chad. cognate.

It does not seem likely *at all* that such Hamitosemitists are aware of the obvious fact that a living language is never static, that language changes constantly in the course of time and as long as it is spoken, and that only dead languages such as Akk., Phoen., Ug., and Egypt., do not change. The most relevant question may be raised: *Is it wise and rational to assert that only dead languages had undergone drastic changes in all linguistic domains before they ceased to be spoken whereas their recently known distant-cousins (Cush. and Chad.) have not undergone any significant changes from the time of Proto-Hamito-Semitic down to the early last two centuries or so? Hasn’t the time come to divorce fantasy from reality?*

7) It is a moral obligation to admit that I have learned a lot *only* from old Arab scholars, and *my work is not so radically different from their best insights into the morphological and semantic structures of ‘a few Arabic roots and words’*. By far the most distinguished of them is *Khalil Bin Ahmad Al Farāhīdī* (died ca. 786 A.D. = 175 H.), who is the originator of both Arabic lexicon (Al ʾAyn) and grammar. His contribution to Arabic grammar is still evident in the work of his disciple *Sibawayhi*, the author of *Al kitāb* (the book), which is still to this day one among very few brilliant works on CA grammar. Two other old Arab scholars must also be mentioned here for their deep insights and brilliant works on CA: *Ibn Jinni* and *Ahmad Bin Faris*.

Had *Khalil Bin Ahmad Al Farāhīdī* (from now on *Farāhīdī*) had had our knowledge and understanding of modern linguistics and of world’s language families, he would certainly have finished this work, which has thus far taken me about 33 consecutive



years, in a matter of few years.

2.1.4 *The form of the root in Hamito-Semitic whether it is of three radicals, of two radicals, or even of one radical is still a puzzle.* The failure of scholars in the past centuries to prove the correctness of ‘*the biliteral theory*’ should not mislead anyone to believe that the essence of the theory is unsound or incorrect. If one (I mean *a Semitist or Hamitosemitist, of course*) has a very serious problem in understanding the surface structure of any **one single root** or **a derivative** with its very complex semantic content, *how would he be able to discover and study its underlying structure?* As a matter of fact, the failure is due not only to the faulty methods employed by such scholars, but also to a complete lack of innate knowledge necessary to identify the biliteral root or uniliteral in a Semitic triliteral and determine the meanings or functions of the remaining elements, which may be a combination of grammatical affixes and/or other meaningful *proots*. This type of knowledge can only be the fruit of a deep understanding of both the surface and the underlying structures (*phonological, morphological, and semantic*) of the triliteral and strict adherence to reason.

2.1.4.1 I find myself obliged to continue using such terms as ‘*biliteral*’, ‘*triliteral*’ and ‘*biliteral or triliteral theory*’, etc. until the end of this research, where HS evidence will overtly speak for itself and determine the type of root PHS had in the subsection §2.25 below entitled ‘*CONCLUDING REMARKS*’. But, the reader will soon come to realize after reading few additional pages of this introduction, i.e. *even before entering into a detailed discussion of HS root structure*, that HS evidence does not support such terms as *triliteralism, biliteralism*, and so forth.

2.1.5 It becomes evident from the first paragraph of section §2.1.3 above that an investigation into the possibility of reconstructing a biliteral or uniliteral root system for Proto-Hamito-Semitic should start from Semitic, since it is the only Hamito-Semitic language group with strict triliteralism. As pointed out above, such Semitic biliteral nouns as ‘*abu* “father” and ‘*binu* “son” are among a very small number of roots which do not fit into this system and are generally considered as having withstood the tendency toward triliterality.<sup>14</sup> *It is only for this reason that a brief account of Semitic root*

---

<sup>14</sup> Semitic has some biliterals and unilaterals expressing meanings virtually essential to any language like terms for family relationships, for some animals, and for some parts of the body. Some examples are:

[’abu] “father” as in Akk. abu, CA ’abu, Ug. ab, Phoen., OArām. ’b, BHeb. ’āb, Sab. ’b, Eth. ’ab.

[binu] “son” as in Akk., CA binu, Ug., Phoen. bn, BHeb. bēn, Sab. bn, OArām. br.

[’aḥu] “brother” as in Akk. aḥu, CA ’aḥu, Ug. aḥ, Phoen., OArām. ’ḥ, BHeb. ’āḥ, Sab. ’h, Eth. ’əḥ.

[’amu] masc. sg. “servant”; fem. ’am(a)-tu as in Akk. am-tu, CA ’ama-tu, Ug., Phoen. ’m-t, OArām. ’mh, BHeb. ’āmā, Eth. ’amat “female servant”.

[ḥamu] “father-in-law” as in Akk. ’emu, CA ḥamu, BHeb. ḥām, Eth. ḥam.: Egyp. ḥm-t “woman, wife” = CA & gen. Sem. ḥamā-t “mother-in-law”.

structure and the traditional assumptions built on them will be given in §2.1.7ff below.

By acting in harmony with what has just been mentioned in §2.1.4.1 above, the present research sides *only tentatively* with the ‘*biliteral and uniliteral theory*’. *It will prove in a way as clear as sunshine that every single HS root is a compound of either two proots or a proot plus one or more bound morphemes, that every bound morpheme has a clear-cut meaning or grammatical function, and that the whole meaning of the word is the sum total of the meanings of its component parts.* For further explanations, illustrations, and classification of morphemes, see §2.1.11 below.

1) As one may not expect *at all*, evidence supporting the claim *will be drawn only from Semitic languages*. This implies that evidence derived from Hamitic language divisions, important though it is, will be excluded from consideration for a number of weighty reasons.

1a) If visible traces of *biliteralism* and *uniliteralism* as clear as sunshine are not found in Semitic, it will be impossible to convince anyone of the theory.

1b) For what concerns Cushitic and Chadic, we know these two divisions from their very late and historically much modified descendants, and there is scarcely anything written in such descendants before the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. For this reason, we cannot convince anyone that PSem. \*ḳtl “to kill”, for example, is from a biradical \*ḳal on the account that its supposed Chushitic cognate consists of two radicals \*ḳl-: ḳala id. However, PSem. \*ḳtl can be from \*ḳl in this research only if conclusive evidence supporting this biradical comes *only* from Semitic. Accordingly, Cushitic, Chadic, Berber will be used only as supplementary evidence and never as evidence by themselves.

1c) The third and by far the most important reason lies in the fact that Semitic provides the clearest evidence of *biliteralism* and of *uniliteralism* which is by far *stronger, more cogent, and more consistent* than anything could be furnished by Hamitic language divisions. This idea will be fully explained in (1e) below.

1d) The Semitic tendency to adopt a PHS grammatical affix or free morpheme as a part of the root is noted in the *entire* Hamitic divisions without exception, and it is, therefore, not a feature peculiar to Semitic. The difference between Semitic and Hamitic in this respect, *and only as far as the surface structure is concerned*, is just *a difference in proportion*. The proportion in Semitic is *somewhat high*, in Cushitic and Chadic is *frequently low*, in Egyptian is *about average*; though bearing in mind the straightforward statement made in (1c) above, and ‘*the statement of fact*’ as will be spelled out in (1e) below.

1e) There is another marked difference between Semitic and Hamitic (Egyp. is excluded) with regard to the segmentation of grammatical affixes. In Semitic the affix

---

[mutu] “man, husband” as in Akk. mutu, Ug. mt, BHeb. met-im (pl.), Eth. met id.: CA matta “be related to”.

[pū] “mouth” as in Akk. pū, Ug., Phoen. p, BHeb. pē, CA fūh-, Eth. ’af.

[šu-] masc; fem. ends with -ā’u or -ātu “sheep” as in Akk. šu’u, CA šā’u ~ šātu “sheep”, OAram. š’h ~ š’t, BHeb. šē, Sab. s<sup>2</sup>h id., Ug. š “male head of small cattle”, Phoen. š. The endings -ā’u and -ātu are feminine suffixes and the original form was masc. [šu].

that forms the basis of the trilateral root can be easily isolated from the original biliteral and its grammatical function or meaning can be determined in most cases with considerable degree of certainty. Moreover, this very same affix appears repeatedly in many other different trilaterals with the same grammatical function or meaning. On the other hand, in Hamitic language divisions the affix is usually either (i) *an inseparable part of the root* or (ii) *a root by itself after the loss of the original root in the course of time*. In consequence, the affix in Hamitic divisions can never be precisely located without evidence from Semitic.

It can therefore be said that *the study of Semitic roots is a reliable guide to the analysis of all Hamitic roots and that the reverse is never true*. This straightforward statement explicitly tells that this work will look at any type of evidence provided by Hamitic language divisions with doubt and skepticism unless it is supported by evidence from Semitic.

1f) The whole research was originally based on Semitic languages with some attention paid only to Egyptian, and it continued to be so for about twenty two years. Only in the last ten years or so I have begun to expand it by considering data from other Hamitic language divisions. It should be remembered, however, that data drawn from such divisions have demonstrated that every single view (a better and real term is ‘*fact*’, not ‘*view*’, since ‘*a view*’ is open to discussion) built on Semitic root structure prior to the data was correct.

2) There is a personal feature in this chapter manifesting itself in the deep conflict between my *mind* and my *intuition* on only few roots which has made the whole study intricate and very rich in details. The painstaking attention to numerous details has been planned in the first place to convince myself, i.e. *my mind*, that my *intuition* is correct. For the same reason, sometimes I prefer to strengthen the establishment of a correct linguistic form by demonstrating why the alternative form is wrong, and sometimes I digress from the main point under discussion to a closely related one in order to bring to light new evidence supporting that point. Another related feature characterizing this work is the strategy it adopts, i.e. *waiting to seize the optimal opportunity to express a scientific view on HS roots, to say a final word on the morphological structure of a complicated and etymologically obscure root, and to explain linguistic phenomena revealed in the study of roots*.

### 2.1.6 *Ahmad Bin Faris*

It is unfair indeed to talk about ‘*biliteralism*’ and ‘*uniliteralism*’ without saying a few words about the Arab linguist *Ahmad Bin Faris*, who died about the end of the second half of the fourth century A.H. In his six volume dictionary *Maḳāyis ’al-Luḡah* (abbreviated as *ML*), Bin Faris appears to be both the first and the only Arab scholar to assume that large numbers of CA trilaterals were originally *biliteral*, and that the great majority of CA roots with more than three radicals had been formed from trilaterals by means of *affixes* and *blending*. Much more important is the fact that Bin Faris recognized many more new bound morphemes (or grammatical affixes) in CA than any scholar before him. Unfortunately, his views on CA roots have been completely overlooked by all his successors, and his dictionary was hardly used as a reference by all

old lexicographers who came after him. In what follows, Bin Faris' views will be stated below with examples from his dictionary, along with my comments and illustrations whenever deemed necessary. As a matter of fact, without my elaborate and profound study of the work, it will remain forever and *for sure* as an inexplicable and incomprehensible enigma.

**2.1.6.1** Bin Faris regards nearly all doubled roots, *those in which the second and third radicals are identical*, as developed from roots with two radicals by repeating the second radical. Accordingly, CA [šbb] “pour out” is from [šb], [ḥtt] “to fall” from [ḥt], [dss] “to insert by stealth” from [ds], and so forth. This view is also held by Semitists. For example, Gray (1971: §88) writes:

«Furthermore, the ‘geminate medial’ type of verbs is apparently an extension of a disyllabic base scheme (cf. BHeb. *bālal* “mix, confuse”: Arab. *balla*: Syr. *balbel*)».

It is to be noted, however, that neither Bin Faris nor Semitists give an explanation of this phenomenon. This phenomenon will be explained in the course of this *introduction*.

Not all biradicals, however, are considered roots by Bin Faris. For example, [tl] “mound, hill” (gen. Sem. tl id.), [tm] “complete” (gen. Sem. tm id.), etc. are roots, while [tḵ] “to fall (from a high place like a mountain)”, [tf], etc. are not (ML I, 338-339). For [tḵ], see §2.7.15 below, and for [tf], see §2.7.5 below.

It should be made clear, however, that Bin Faris' view on doubled roots faithfully reflects that of Farāhīdī, who had much earlier considered them biliterals (see his eight volume dictionary *Al 'Ayn*). It will be demonstrated with ample evidence— starting from §2.1.6.5 below – that such biradicals are later development in CA and its sister languages.

**2.1.6.2** Reduplicative roots are also from roots with two radicals; hence CA [š'š'] “to open the eyes (puppy)” is from [š'] (ML III, 280). In earlier and later dictionaries the root is considered quadriliteral (see *Al 'Ayn* VII, 175; *Jamharh* I, 226; LA, r. š'š', etc.), [d'd'] is from [dw] (cf. ML II, 262), but in other dictionaries is a quadriliteral (see *Al 'Ayn* VIII, 101; *Jamharah* I, 227; LA, r. d'd'), and so forth.

Unlike all modern Semitists, Bin Faris does not consider weak trilaterals to have arisen from original biliterals. On the matter of weak roots in general, Moscati (1969: §11.6b), like other Semitists, surmises the following misleading belief:

«The so-called weak verbs exhibit many biradical forms: e.g. Heb. *ḵām* “he rose” (root *ḵwm*), 'ē-šeb “I dwell” (root *yšb*), Ar. *ram(a)-t* “she threw” (root *rmy*), etc. It is our grammatical systematization which looks upon these forms as having ‘dropped’ a radical, while one might maintain with as much reason that the weak radical – in those forms which contain it – was, in fact, added to the root for the sake of adaptation to the triconsonantal system».

A clear cut distinction must be made between an original biliteral, the subject of our study, and a later biliteral which has been the product of linguistic decay as Heb. *ḵām*

has arisen from \*kawam-, Phoen. *kn* “be” from \*kawan-, Ug. ‘*r*’ “ass” from \*‘ayr-. Now, the change of root consonant /w/ or /y/ into a long vowel, short vowel, /-’-/ or /-y-/ is never evidence for biliteralism, but rather a type of conspicuous and unquestionable evidence against it since any of such changes is regular and subject to rigid rules (see §2.1.7, n. b below).

**2.1.6.3** Roots with more than three radicals were formed by blending two or more roots or by means of affixes (i.e. *root-affixes*), which could be *prefixes*, *infixes*, or *suffixes*. Hundreds of roots are found throughout Bin Faris’ six-volume dictionary. They all confirm the former presence of *many affixes* in CA. For the sake of brevity and of keeping the research within its proper scope, the examples discussed below will be confined to very few of such blends and affixes. We will start with ‘*affixes*’.

a) ‘*abharu* “one who is great in figure or stature”, i.e. lit. *one that dazzles in figure*” < *bahru* “dazzling”, *bahara* “to dazzle” (ML IV, 358): BHeb. *bahere*-t, fem., “brightness”, Eth. *bhr* “be bright, light” (OT, 116). The obvious fact is that initial /’-/ is a proot, and that the remaining word is a compound of at least two stems: [bah] and [’ar] (see §3.14.8 below).

b) ‘*urqubu* “heel of an animal” > ‘*arqaba* “to cut off the heel of an animal” < ‘*aqibu* “heel of a human being” (ML IV, 359): Akk. *iḫbu*, BHeb., Syr., BAram., Mand. ‘*qb* id. (OT, 809f; MD, 356). For infixed \*-r- here and other similar infixes brought about by dissim., see §2.17.80 below.

c) ‘*aqrabu* “scorpion” < ‘*aqaru* (ML IV, 360). Sem. [’qrb] is a compound and will be discussed in depth in §2.23.6, n. 2 below.

**2.1.6.4** There seems to be another hitherto *unknown suffix* in CA which is /-d/ as in *ḍafandadu* “bulky” from *ḍifanu* “stupid and bulky in figure” (ML III, 401). However, LA (r. ḍfd) derives the word from *ḍafida* “be bulky and stupid”, but *hastens to admit that the last /-d/ is a suffix*. There is unquestionable evidence confirming the presence of this suffix in the language. LA (r. rhd) admits that

«*rihwaddu* “soft, flabby” is from *rihwu* id., and -d was  
suffixed to it and doubled jus as in *fa’ama* > *fa’maddu*».

Like *ḍafandadu*, *rihwaddu*, and *fa’maddu* above, is the subst. (n. or adj.) ‘*arandadu*, with infixed /-n-/, “solidity, hardness”: ‘*uruddu* or, with /-n-/ in place of the 1<sup>st</sup> /-d-/ (by dissimil.), ‘*urundu* “strong, solid, hard (of anything)”; ‘*arada* “to stand erect with strength, solidity, or hardness”, hence ‘*ardu* “penis having such characteristics”; ‘*arada*, said esp. of the canine (also of plants, etc.), expresses simultaneously three semantic notions “to rise or emerge altogether + to be strong or hard + to stand erect”. The addition of /-s/ to [’rd] gives rise to a quadriliteral adjective [’rds] as in ‘*arandasu* masc. “strong, powerful”, Proto-Southern Cush. \*‘ûr “strength” (RPAA, n. 697). All are ultimately from PHS stem [’ar] to rise, stand erect; high, etc. see §§2.8.4-2.8.6.

**2.1.6.5** Bin Faris also presents evidence pointing to the earlier presence of prefixed /d-/ as in *damšaqa* “to act/make/do something fast or rapidly” < *mašaḳu* “rapid stabbing or piercing” (ML II, 238), *daḥraša* “make something clear, manifest”; *diḥriṣu*

“knowledgeable (man)” < *haraša* “to estimate with sagacity and smartness” (ML II, 239), *darbasa* “to advance, go forward” < [rbs] (ML II, 340).

1) A careful study of all roots beginning with /d-/ in CA and all other Hamito-Semitic languages gives me no chance but to admit the former presence of a bound morpheme [d-] not only in CA, but also in all of its close and distant sister languages *excluding no one*. The suffix was originally, like most other affixes, a free morpheme and, in the course of millennia, it has become permanently attached to the root in all HS language division, except Egyptian *only in some of its occurrences*. In addition to Egyptian, CA has preserved obvious traces of this earlier morpheme, and, in most cases, the prefix is quite easy to recognize in that language, e.g. *da’aka* “to throng and press together” is clearly based on *’akka*-tu “a crowd or throng in a narrow place”; CVIII *’atakka* (unfamiliar stem ?) “be crowded”<sup>15</sup>. Another obvious example is {d + hwr} < [hwr] (see §2.1.6.11, n. 6 below).

2) As has been just mentioned, Egyptian preserved the oldest form of the prefix when it was used as a free morpheme, appearing as [d’] and signifying “to cause, make” also “to give, put, place, allow”, but in the course of time, the free morpheme had lost its independent existence as a root in some of its occurrences in Egyp. and became a bound morpheme, i.e. *it can occur attached to another free morpheme or root*. The part of speech with which [d’] was originally combined is the noun. Some examples illustrating how the free morpheme was used in Egyptian are:

2a) Egyp. d’ ’k’ “to destroy”, consisting of [d’] “cause” (EHD II, 865) and [’k’] “destruction, ruin”: ’k “to become weak, to feel pain or sorrow” also “destruction” (EHD I, 11) ~ yk “to suffer injury, be lost or destroyed”; yk-t “pain, injury, something lost” = Sem. [’ak ~ ’ak] id. (see §2.1.6.5.1, n. 2 below).

2b) Egyp. d’ ’k-t “to destroy” (EHD II, 865), consisting of [d’] “to cause, make” and ’k-t “destruction, ruin”: ’k “to fail, to be tired, be weary, be exhausted, to come to an end, to die, to perish”; ’kw “destruction, ruin” ~ y’kw “loss, want” ~ yk’-t “destruction, ruin, loss, injury”: yk “to lose, be injured” (EHD I, 10, 25, 92) = Sem. [’ak] as in CA *’akā* “detest eating and drinking because of illness” (LA).

2c) Egyp. d’ ḥm-t “to marry” (EHD II, 866): ḥm-t “wife, woman” (EHD I, 481; EG, 581): Egyptian two words d’ ḥm-t is seen in CA as *daḥama* [dḥm] “have sexual intercourse with a woman” and *Duḥma*-tu *female proper name*. On the other hand, Egyp. ḥm-t = Semitic ḥm-t as in CA *ḥamā*-t “mother-in-law”, and is from the same root in Ug. ḥm- “pregnancy”, etc. (see §2.12.23 below).

2d) Egyp. d’ yrí “cause to do, make to be done” (EHD II, 865): cf. yrí “to do, make, act” (EG, 554; EHD I, 65) = CA *’ar-* “to do, make, work” (§2.1.6.7, n. 6c below).

2e) Egyp. d’ wn “to cause to be” (EHD II, 865): cf. wn “to be, to exist” = CA *’n* id. (see §2.1.6.5.24 below).

2f) Egyp. d’ mš’ “to walk”, orig. “to cause to walk” (EHD II, 866) = CA *mašy* “a walk”; *mašā* (*mašaya*) “to walk”, and so forth.

2g) Egyp. d’ ḥr “to turn the face toward someone” (EHD II, 866): Egyp. ḥr “face” =

<sup>15</sup> The stem is not CV of a root \*[’tk].

CA [ḥr] in dual ḥurra-tāni “the two cheeks”.

2h) Egyp. *da' s'* “to give the back” (EHD II, 866): *s'* “the back” = CA \*sa' in compounds id.

2i) Egyp. *d' ḥr t'* “to put on the ground, depose, throw into the street” (EHD II, 866): final [t'] = “earth” and is seen in many other Egyp. expressions, such as *sn t'* “smell + the earth”, and [ḥr] “on” (see §2.1.6.5.24, n. 2b below). It is also seen in the entire Semitic languages in compound trilaterals (see §2.17.29).

2k) Egyp. *d' d-t* “to give hands” (EHD II, 866): d-t “hands” = Semitic yadu “hand”.

3) Examples showing that the free morpheme [d'] lost its independent status in Egyp. and used as a bound morpheme /d-/ with nouns are:

3a) Egyp. dpd-t “bow” is derived from [d'] “make” and [pd] “bow”, and its original meaning was ‘make a bow’: cf. Egyp. pd “bow” (EHD I, 256; II, 877) = CA faḏdu “dart, arrow”.

3b) Egyp. dbḥ “to pray, beseech, supplicate, entreat”; dbḥw “supplicant, petitioner, beggar” also “propitiatory, offerings”; dbḥ-t “prayer, supplication, entreaty” (EHD II, 876). The very same [bḥ] is also seen in all HS language divisions, including Egyp., with prefixed causative /š-/ (see §2.2.27 below).

3c) Egyp. ds “to sit, be seated” (EHD II, 887) ~ dys (EHD II, 868) “to sit” is from \*'as, also seen in tys “to sit, be seated”; tys' “to set, inlay, insert” (EHD II, 822), Chad.: Tala tēsu “to sit”, Sha tēs “put down” (see §2.7.32 below), with suffixed -t: Egyp. yst, st “seat, throne” (see §2.9.18, n. 5 below). It is also the very same proot in *d' r ys-t* “to put in (its) place, i.e. restore” (EHD II, 866). This root, whose surface structure is markedly different from its underlying one in all HS language divisions, will be studied in depth in such sections as §§2.9.18 & 2.12.43 below.

3d) Egyp. dbn “to circle, revolve, make the circuit of a place, go about, wander around a place” is based on bnn-t “ball, some ball-shaped object, apple of the eye, eye-ball”: bnn pl. “ring, bracelet” (EHD I, 217; II, 875). Its cognates in other sister languages are perh. Tna. dāmbəlbəl bälä “be round”, Amh. tān-däballälä “roll”, Har. an-dōlāla “make round”; dulālu “round”, A. əndəballä-m “circular”, Z. dumbululīt “round” (HED, 28) = Sab. dbl “ball of dates”. The meaning of the trilateral is preserved in dibla-tu fem. “ring of engagement”<sup>16</sup>.

4) Semitic, Chadic, Cushitic, and Berber cognates of some Egyptian two separate word forms, such as d' 'k and d' 'ḳ (above in 1a and 1b), appeared to have coalesced together so as to form roots [dk] and [dḳ] respectively, with each root having a number of variants, like [dwk], [d'k] ~ [d'ḳ], etc. The variants represented an earlier stage of the two cited bilaterals; a stage at which Hamito-Semitic tribes began to feel that the two words are morphologically indivisible.

### 2.1.6.5.1 Evidence for an Earlier /d-/ in Hamito-Semitic

Sem. [dkk]: as in Akk. dakāku “broyer”, Ug. dk “broyer”, Tham. tdk “se battre”, SA:

<sup>16</sup> SL, Leb. etc. da'bal “make round”. For an explanation for /-'/, see below.

Jib., Hars. dek “heurter”, Soq. ’edek “battre (coeur), frapper du pied”, Eth.: Te. dākkā “broyer, frotter” (DRS IV, 257), CA dakka “to destroy, to pulverize, to pound, to beat down, to press down”, BHeb. dak “crushed, broken”, hence *dejected, afflicted, oppressed, unhappy*: Ps. 9. 10. 10, 18. 74, 21 (OT, 223), Chad.: Housa daka “to pound”, Bolewa dak-, Tangale tug, Mbara dak “to trample”, Logone tku “to strike” (HSED, n. 633; Müller, 1975: 70, n. 80).

1) All words above are from a compound of [da’] “make, cause” and a noun [’ak-] ‘*destruction, ruin*’, as in Eyp d’ ’k’ “to destroy” above. It may thus be said that [d’-] is originally placed before a noun to create a word signifying ‘make/cause + meaning of the noun’. The notion ‘destruction, ruin’ may extend to ‘*one’s health*’ > “feel pain, ache; fever, emaciation, illness; metal suffering > feel sorrow, distress, despair; cares, annoyance; apathy; fear; anxious”; to ‘*one’s body*’ > “injure, harm, strike, damage; crush; trample”; to ‘*one’s physical, energy, vigor, strength*’ > “be tired, weary; in sore straits, enfeeble”; to ‘*one’s moral*’ > “err, sin”, to ‘*one’s life*’ > “come to an end, die, perish”; to ‘*one’s property ~ one’s wealth*’, i.e. house, field, land, cattle > indigence, straits, etc.; to ‘*one’s surrounding environment*’ > calamity, and the like.

2) PHS \*’ak- as in Akk. ukkū “être faible, invalide”; \*ekū(m) “souffrir de privations”; ekū “indigent”; ekūtu “faiblesse, débilité, etc.” (DRS IV, *ibid.*) = Eyp. ’k “to become weak, feel pain; destruction” ~ yk “to suffer injury, be lost or destroyed”; ’k-t “pain, injury” (EHD I, 11, 94) = CA ’akka-tu “calamity, hardship, disaster”; ’atakka “be knocked (knees), be annoyed, disturbed” (ML I, 17-18; LA).

3) PHS \*da’ ’ak > Sem. \*da-’k-, then by ‘*complete regressive assimilation*’ > Sem. [dkk]. Other variants of \*da’ ’ak- are:

3a) Akk. dāku [r. dwk] “battre, tuer, briser”, Aram. Jp. dāk “broyer” (DRS IV, 234), Pun. dwk “to shatter” (NWSI I, 243), BHeb. dūk “to pound, to beat in a mortar, to bray”, BAram. dwk, CA dāka id. (OT, 217), PChad. \*d-k “to kill” (Müller, 1975: 70, n. 80; Carnochan, 1975: 464). Sem. \*da-’k- > \*dwk, i.e. \*-’- > \*w.

3b) BHeb. dikkā [dk’] “to break in pieces, to crush”; Pual. “be broken, crushed, bruised”, dākāh [dky] id. (OT, 223-224).

3c) BHeb. d’k “to go out, be extinguished, quenched”; Niph. “become extinct”; Pual. “be destroyed” (OT, 231), OffAram. d’k “be extinguished, quenched”, Targ. ni-d’ak “be crushed, trampled, annihilated”, Eth.: Te. da’aka “to trample, crush” (DRS IV, 291; NWSI I, 257), CA da’aka “to rub down, to mash”; mad’ūk- “corrupt (in the sense ‘*destroyed*’ or ‘*no longer useful*’). The pharyngeal /-’-/ is variant of /-’-/ and, for what concerns CA (and perh. other Sem. languages), it is easier to pronounce the word with /-’-/ than with /-’-/ esp. when the initial radical is voiced, hence [m’k], [w’k], etc. (see §2.10.24 below) are, among many others, based on \*’ak-. As we have seen above, CA has a root [d’k], but it is not productive and has never been in common use as it stands. It is strange indeed that the use of its derivatives CI \*da’aka and CVI \*tadā’aka always involves the transposition of -’ak to -ka’ (cf. BHeb. dk’ above), hence daka’a and tadāka’a respectively. Metathesis here, as in most similar cases, has given rise to a new root [k’] = ’k in meaning. Another related fact must be recognized is that the interchange of /’/ and /’/ is common in Semitic and Egyptian in general (see below §2.1.6.5.2, n. 2b,



§2.2.22, n. d and e, §2.17.2, etc.) and CA in particular<sup>17</sup>.

**2.1.6.5.2 Sem.** [dķķ]: as in Akk. *duķķuķu* “to pound, pulverize, crush”, BHeb. *dāķaķ* “to beat small, break in pieces, to crush”, esp. by *pounding, stamping, threshing*, BAram. Syr. *dķķ* “be beaten small, broken in pieces”, Mand. *dķķ* “to pound, reduce to powder, break into small fragments, crush” (OT, 232; MD, 113; DRS IV, 305), CA *daķķa* “to pound, to pulverize, to reduce to powder, to crush, beat small”, Pun. *dķ-t* “pulverized” (NWSI I, 257), Ge. *dāķķā* “to crush, to pound”, Har. *dēdāķa* “to level off by pressing down, to compress”, Tna. *dāķādāķ* “to squeeze, to press down”, Amh. *dāķāddāķā* “to dig”, W. *deddāķā* “to crush, to pound” (HED, 54), and with initial d- being reduplicated: Ge. *dadaķa*, *daddaķa*, *dādadaķa* “batter, frapper, tomber sur”, etc. (DRS III, 224), Berb.: Kab. *duķķ* “to strike, pound”, Chad.: Housa *dan-daķa* “to pound”, Ngizim *ḍəku* id. (HSED, n. 635), Cush.: PSC \**duk-* “be broken to pieces” (RPAA, n. 135), Ga. *daka* “to grind”; *daku* “powder”.

Also belong here Akk. *daķāķu* “small, thin”, Ug. *dķ* “small” (UG, 536), CA *dīķķu* = anything small and thin; *daķīķu* “small, thin, fine, minute”, hence “flour, powder”; *duķāķu* “powder, dust, flour”, Ge. *dāķīķ* “little, minute”, Tna. *dāķāķā*, “be fine, subtle”, Amh. *dāķķāķā* “small, thin” (HED, 58), Chad. Housa *aķo* “clay soil”, Berb.: Sus *idāķķi* “clay”, Cush.: Som. *dīķ* “become faint”, Oromo *dīķķa* “small” (HSED, 161). Egyp., too, adopted /da’/ as a part of the root: cf. *dķ* “flour, a kind of grain” = CA *daķīķu* id. above. All are from \*da’ + \*aķ-.

1) Sem. [dķķ], like [dkk] above, is a compound consisting of [da’] “to cause, make” and a n. [’aķ-] “destruction, ruin”.

2) Variants of Sem. [dķķ] are similar to those of [dkk] above, e.g.

2a) [dwķ] as in CA *dawķu* “pounding, crushing and grinding”; *dāķa* “to crush, pound”; mi-dwaku inst. a stone used for this purpose; *dāķa* also “become ill”, Aram.: Jb., Talm. *dūķ* “réduire en poussière”, Syr. *dūķ* “to pound”, Mand. *duķ* “to pound, chop, break up small by blows” (DRS IV, 238; MD, 105).

2b) CA *da’aķa* “to trample or tread under foot, to crush, to slay, to damage”, Eth.: Te. *dā’aķā* “to trample, to crush” (DRS IV, 293). Some old Arab scholars considered /-’-/ of [d’ķ] as being used instead of medial /-ķ-/ of [dķķ], some others treated it as an extra letter, and still others rejected both views (LA). The bound morpheme /-’-/ may be variant of /-’-/ and a similar instance is found in Egyp., where ‘ķ also signifies “to

<sup>17</sup> Some examples from CA are: *ġa’afa* ~ *ġa’afa* “to kill”, *ḍu’āfu* ~ *ḍu’āfu*, said of poison, “killing fast” (ŠHH IV, 1334, 1361), *da’ṯu* ~ *da’ṯu* “grudge, enmity”, *da’ama* ~ *da’ama* “to prop (e.g. a wall)”, *k’f* ~ *k’f* “to uproot” (LA), *tašā’a* ~ *tašā’a* “be far apart” (ŠHH VI, 2388), *šā’a* ~ *šā’a* “to scream, shout” (ŠHH VI, 2397), *’indara’a* ~ *’indara’a* “to attack”, *kaṯa’a* ~ *kaṯa’a* “thicken (milk)” (LA; ML, IV, 3), *’ādā* (from *’a’dā*) ~ *’a’dā* “to strengthen and help” (Amāli II, 78; LA), CIV *’abhala* ~ *’abhala* “to neglect, leave without shepherd” (LA), etc. In some cases the interchange is due to old dialectal differences as in *’an* ~ *’ann*, which becomes *’an* ~ *’ann* in old Tamīm (Al ‘Ayn VIII, 398).

To the first pair of verbs cited above, one can also add the variants *ġa’fa*, *ġafa’*, and the quadrilateral *ġa’fala* (Amāli I, 104).

Finally, what I call here ‘interchange’ may not apply to all pairs of words above: see §2.2.22, n. d below.

destroy”. In Akk., too, /’/ is also found (see §2.7.28 below)<sup>18</sup>.

3) The evolutionary history of morpheme \*/d/ and of many other newly discovered HS affixes in this research such as causatives \*š- and \*’-, of reflexive \*t-, and \*-t-, of reflexive passive \*n-, of proots \*pa’-, \*paW-, of [ba’], of \*ba-, of [‘a’], of \*Wal-, of haW-, of \*n-, and so forth, reflects a true picture of what language is and furnishes ample evidence on how it changes and evolves regularly and systematically in the course of time. All such affixes had been originally ‘*independent*’ or ‘*full*’ words with distinct meanings *as many of them still do in Egyp. and some of them in CA*, and in the course of millennia they have gradually fused with noun, verb, and adjective stems in some or in all of their occurrences in HS language divisions. It is important to note, however, that the process of ‘*fusion*’ for some affixes, such as, /t-/ , /-t/, /-t-/ , /n-/ , /-n-/ , /-n/, /m-/ , /-m-/ , /h-/ , etc. in a language like CA, though was checked by Arab grammarians and lexicographers of the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> centuries, it has nevertheless persisted at a slow pace throughout the Classical period and well into *the last century*<sup>19</sup>, while for some other affixes, such as causative /s-/ , /b-/ , /-b/ and /w-/ , it had been completed by the 7<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> century of our era. This is evident from old Arab scholars’ definitions of the significations of words and their views on their morphological structures. In addition, and as we will see in this research, the same scholars recognized many of them as affixes in some traditional roots. I will elaborate on these ideas whenever occasions permit: see, for example, §2.1.14.4, under *Comments* below.

As has been pointed out above, HS /d-/ is originally a free root [da’] expressing “make, cause” and, in the course of millennia, the root has gradually lost its autonomous status and become a mere bound affix attached permanently to the root in all Hamito-

---

<sup>18</sup> Suppose that /’-/ is not variant, the word [‘aḳ] is clearly a compound of ‘a- “great” (see §2.14 below) plus [‘aḳ] “destruction”. Whether /’-/ is or is not variant, the obvious fact is that the verb is derived from a noun.

<sup>19</sup> The term ‘*last century*’ dates here my native dialect, i.e SL, a type of a primitive Arabic dialect spoken in Bint Jbeil (South Lebanon) down to about 1960 or 1965 without being exposed to any significant influence from other dialects, since means of transportation and communication were almost nonexistent, described in an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Linguistics (Georgetown University, 1983). After about 1965, it has become increasingly exposed to the marked influence of Beirut dialect and other Lebanese dialects. It is very conservative on the level of roots and *their primitive and special significations*, and there are differences in the treatment of some roots between the dialect and CA. For example, two or more CA and Semitic roots may render one in the dialect (see, for instance, §2.1.6.6, n. 5, ft. 1 below and §2.16.12 below), and a CA or Semitic indivisible triliteral is perceived in the dialect as consisting of a number of free and bound morphemes, e.g. CA darbasa (see §2.1.6.5 above) is used as a substance *m-darbis* “too short (lit. low) in stature”, consisting of m- (mu-) “one who is”, \*da- “make, cause”, \*-r- from 1st \*-b- of \*-dabbas by dissimilation (for *dissimilation* in all Semitic languages, see §3.17.80 below), and \*-bis from CA [bs] “debase, etc.” (see §2.3.48 n. a below). It is this dialect which enables me to see with a bare eye the constituent elements of a Semitic triliteral, and to look upon any linguistic feature, as, for instance, Egyp. [d’] above or Oakk. and CA \*/-l/ “afore”, as a very familiar one on which I can give off-hand many illustrations from CA and other Semitic languages. Note that without SL, it will be impossible to discover Semitic \*-l “afore”, and so many others. Even without Egyp. evidence on [d’], the caus. d- is present as such in SL in some obvious roots. Finally, without SL, it will also be impossible to explain and evaluate Bin Faris’ work and other old Arab scholars’ views.

Semitic languages as we have just seen above and will see below.

**2.1.6.5.3** After having been firmly established as autonomous roots in HS language divisions, [dk] and [dķ] began to tread on the heels of other fellow roots by adopting appropriate bound morphemes as inseparable parts of them. Consider the following examples which includes roots /ha-/ (see §2.4 below).

a) Aram.: Talm. haddēķ, NHeb. hiddēķ “to press” (DRS V, 378), CA hadaķa “to break, crush”.

b) CA hadaka “to demolish, knock down, destroy”, esp. *a house*, BHeb. hādak “to trample under foot” (OT, 244; DRS V, 375), etc<sup>20</sup>.

For the ‘*phenomenon of historical development and growth*’ of [dk] and [dķ], see ‘*Comments*’ below, and bear in mind that I am not concerned in this introduction with the question whether /-k/ and /-ķ/ are here instances of the same phoneme.

#### *Comments I*

The historical evolution of {da’ + ’ak} into [d’k], [dwk], [dkk], [d’k], etc. and of [dkk] into [hdk], [wdk], etc., of [dķķ] into [šdķ], etc., took place at different historical stages of HS and over several millennia, *beginning* with the oldest, e.g. {da’ ’ak}, and then proceeding to the later stages in a step-by-step procedure. Throughout such stages HS languages had been subject to incessant changes, as their surviving dialects still do, not only in the whole root system or in word formation, but also in all other linguistic domains- *phonology, semantics*, etc., as we will see in this research. The picture thus displayed before our eyes shows the evolution of HS languages in a natural and systematic order; each stage began when the immediately preceding stage had been firmly established. From here, knowledge of a preceding stage is essential to a scientific study of its following stage. Thus, [hadak] is based upon [dak] and not upon \*da’ ’ak-, and consists of bound proot /ha-/ (§2.4 below) plus a stem /dak/.

Another clear example displaying the same picture is that Bin Faris’ work is generally confined to roots with more than three consonants, and that many of such roots were considered by him as recent inventions, i.e. *made up of affixes plus triliterals*. He rarely dealt with a strong triliteral in order to show that one of its radicals is an affix or *extra letter*. The reason for this is obvious; he was dealing only *with one of the latest stages of CA growth, which he witnessed*. This particular stage was, as a matter of fact, a mere linguistic product of many preceding stages of constant change, exactly as modern Arabic dialects are a natural outcome of stages of change, starting from Bin Faris’ time.

#### *Comments II*

As one should expect, [da’] is not the only morpheme combined with [’ak] and [’aķ]

---

<sup>20</sup> Prefixed /h-/ is not the only affix becoming an integral part of the root. In fact, there are other affixes such as /w-/: CA [wdk] “calamity, misfortune” in a fixed expression: «*laķai-tu min-hu banati ’awdaka*», etc.

to yield a large number of trilaterals, [taʾ], too, can do the same with both proots<sup>21</sup>:

a) Akk. *teʾiktu* “injury, damage”, etc. see §2.7.28 below.

b) Akk. *takāku* “to press”, in CA “to trample, step on”, in Cush. “to strike”, etc. see §2.10.17 below. To the new root [tak] other proots can be added to create additional trilaterals such as [twk], [mtk], [htk], etc. This is how language develops in the course of time. See §2.1.6.5.2, n. 2a above.

**2.1.6.5.4** CA *daġna-tu* “darkness”; *midġānu* “dark”; CIV *ʾadġana*, CXII *ʾidġawġana* “become dark”; *daġanu* “clothed or covered with clouds (said of earth or sides of the sky)”, Syr. *degen* “être affaiblie (vue)”; *degnā* “ophtalmie, neige” (DRS III, 220). With interchange of /-n/ and /-m/, CA *duġma-tu* “darkness”; *daġama* “be dark (night)”, Chad.: Kera *duugŋ* “at night”, Cush.: Oromo *dukkana* “darkness”, Bambala *dukkani* “darkness, cloud” (HSED, 168).

a) Ug. *m-dg-t* “lieu ténébreux” (DRS III, 217), CA *duġġa-tu* “intense darkness, obscurity; cloudy and dark”; *daġdāġa-tu* fem., *daġūġu*, *dayġūġu* masc., *dayāġīġu*<sup>22</sup> pl. “very dark; darkness”; *daġdaġa* “be dark, be cloudy”; *duġuġu* “black mountains”; *daġġa* “to hide, to let down a curtain”.

b) CA *duġya-tu* [r. *dġw ~ dġy*] “darkness, hunter’s shelter or hidden-place”; *daġā* “to conceal, hide”; *ʾadġā* “to fall (night)”; *dāġā* “to come at night” also “to hide, conceal (one’s true feelings)”, Egyp. *dg* “to hide oneself, be hidden”; *dgʾi-t* “something hidden” (EHD II, 891; EG, 603); caus. *s-tg* “to hide oneself, take refuge”, is from *\*s-dġ* and /-d-/ becomes /-t-/ by progressive assimilation, hence also *s-dg* “to hide” exists.

It is plainly evident that *\*d-* in all trilaterals above is a prefix (= *make*), and that the real proot is *\*-ga-* “cover, roof” as in Akk. *gaggu*, Ug. *gg*, etc. see §2.2.37 below. To this proot certainly belong Ge. *dagu* “to cheat”, Har. *dāga* “mistake” (HED, 54), and Cush.: Som. *dag* “to deceive” = SL *dēžā* “to deceive, conspire against” (< CA *dāġā* “hide, conceal one’s true feelings” above), with -l ext.: CA *daġalu* “humbug; lie”, etc. For Semitic complex trilateral [dgl] and its basic meanings in different languages, see §2.1.6.5.9 below.

#### Comments I

c) A combination of [ga] “roof” and [-n] forms a noun stem [gan] “a cover” as a vb “to cover” as in Akk. *ganānu*, *kanānu* “to shut up, to confine”, BHeb. *gānan* “to cover over; protect”, Syr. *gānā* “to hide”, *gann* “to protect”, OffAram. *gnn*, Palm. *ʾgn id*, CA *ġanna* “to cover (over), conceal” (~ *kanna id* as in Akk.); CIV *ʾaġanna* “to hide”; *ġannu* “anything that covers”; *ġinnu*, said of the night, “intense darkness”; *ġanānu* “night”, etc., Akk. *maginnu*, CA *miġannu*, Phoen. *mgn*, Ug. *mgn*, etc. “shield”, also CA *ġunna-tu* “protection, shield, head-cover” (NWSI II, 593; OT 200; DRS III, 147). Here also belong Akk. *ganūnu*, *gininu* “grande salle (dans un temple, un palais)”, Syr. *gnn*, Mand. *gnana* “wedding chamber”, Syr. *gann* “to live in a place, inhabit”, etc. (DRS III, 147,

<sup>21</sup> Both [daʾ-] and [taʾ-] are variants of one form.

<sup>22</sup> One can add /-r/ to *dayāġīġu* pl. without any change of meaning, hence *dayāġīġru* pl. *id*.

148; MD, 95), Sab. gn' "wall of town, fortress" (SD, 50). This extended notion of [gan] has been best preserved in CA CII daġġana "to domesticate animals", i.e. *only in the sense to adapt them to man's home or place*: CI daġana "become accustomed or used to a house or a place, to stick to a place", whence comes dawāġinu pl. "domestic animals"; masc. sg. dāġinu, fem. dāġina-tu.

Like prefixed \*d-, other prefixes (i.e. proots) can also be added to both \*gu- and \*gin, \*gan, esp. \*š- and \*ʾ- to enrich HS with new roots.

e) We have just noted above that Akk.-CA /k-/ and /g-/ *can both co-occur in the same phonological environment without any change of deep meaning*. The same proot (i.e. \*kaW-) is also found in Hamitic: Egyp. knm.t "darkness", Chad.: Bud. kenun "night", Migama kelmo, Mokilko kelēmo, Sokoro kilmio "shadow" (HSED, n. 1446).

### Comments II

As with [dgn] above, [daʾ] can also combine with [kan] to form a similar compound trilateral [dkn] expressing a similar meaning as in CA daknu "dark, blackish, dark-grey"; dakina "to become blackish, to darkle"<sup>23</sup>, Cush.: Ga. dukana "darkness, gloom", caus. dukanesa "darken, obscure".

It goes without saying that [dkn] is ultimately based on \*kaW- as in Chad.: Sura koo, Mupun kūo, Angas pi-kwi, Chip pe-kowo "dark" (HSED, n. 1509).

**2.1.6.5.5** Eth.: Har. dīġa "to come"; adīġa "to bring"; *yidiġal hamīs* "next Thursday"<sup>24</sup>, S. ġeġe "to arrive", W. ġeġe id., Amh. žig, etc. are assumed to be from Sid. dayi. Littmann connects the Har. word with Ge. dāḥḥada "slip" (see HED, 55). They are from \*daʾ "make" plus the root in CA ġāʾa "to come"; CIV caus. ʾaġāʾa "to bring".

As for the Ge. word above, it is unrelated to that of Har., and is cognate with CA daḥḥada id.

**2.1.6.5.6** Egyp. dg, dgg, "to see, to look at, to examine, scrutinize"; dgʾ-t "look, sight", tg, tgʾ "to see, look at" (EHD II, 846, 891; EEG, 603), Cush.: Saho ḍag- "to know, to learn", Afar dag-, ḍag id., Kambatta dag-, deg- "to know", Chad.: Kera ḍigi "to think" (HSED, n. 618): see §2.1.6.5.7 below.

**2.1.6.5.7** Egyp. dkʾ, tkʾ "to look, to see" (EHD II, 845, 890): see §2.1.6.5.9 below.

**2.1.6.5.8** Ge. ʾadhara "retarder, laisser derrière"; tadhara "être en retard, rester"; dāḥr "partie postérieure, fin"; dāḥra "derrière, après"; daḥḥara "hesiter", etc., Te. dāharā "être humble, petit"; dāhur "bas", Tna. dāharā "rester en arrière", Amh. dāharay "partie postérieure da la selle", SA: Soq. ṯḥar "rester" (DRS IV, 251), CA dahara "be humble,

<sup>23</sup> CA dukna-tu, *the color of ʾadkan*, i.e. "black, grey and black", while duġna-tu "the ugliest black color". A variant [dkl] occurred once in Poet.:

«... wa faḍlun binaṣli (ʾa)s saifi wa (ʾa)s sumuri (ʾa)d dukli» (instead of dukni).

The interchange of /n/ and /l/ is common in the language and in both directions.

<sup>24</sup> In SL ʾal hamīs ʾal žēye id., i.e. lit. *the Thursday the coming*.

abased” as in the Koran: (وكل أتوه داخرين), *and all should come unto Him abased* (37: 87). All are from a compound consisting of \*da’- and the common Semitic trilateral [ʾhr] as in CA CII ʾahhara “to delay, retard, be last, be behind, be late”; taʾahhara “to linger, delay, tarry, be late”; ʾāhir “last, end”; ʾuħrin “behind”; mu-ʾahhara-tu fem. “hinder part, posterior; rear”. In addition, ʾāhiru in *Hadith*: «ʾal masʾalatu ʾāhiru kasbi (ʾa)l marʾi» expresses “abased, mean”, Akk. ahāru “rester en arrière”, Ug. ʾħr “après”, Pun. ʾħr “rester”, Heb. ʾaħar “derrière, après”, Ge. ʾahhara “différer, retarder”; ʾahāri “postérieur”, etc. (DRS I, 15), Te. ħar “behind”, Har. āħār-be “behind, in the back”, Z. bā-irā-nu “after”, S., W. -rer id. (HED, 23).

**2.1.6.5.9** Akk. dagālu “to see, look at, consider”; digl- “sight, desire, mirror”, Syr. dāgal “to aim”; dāgilūtā “sight”, Chad.: Msg dāgʷələ “to look” (HSED, n. 757). The CA cognate cited by Cohen (DRS III, 219) is daġala “parcourir un pays”, BHeb. degel “flag, banner”. On his comment on BHeb. [dgl], Gesenius (OT, 214) sees that «*The signif. of ‘glittering’, ‘shining’, which I formerly ascribed to this root... now seems to me hardly susceptible of proof*».

The following detailed discussion of CA root [dġl], like my discussion of any root above or below, esp. *when it is still in use in SL*, will present a thorough explanation of the origin and historical development of Hamito-Semitic [dgl].

a) CA [dgl] does not express overtly any of the above-mentioned meanings. It signifies a number of ideas, one of which is “to lie, deceive; to misrepresent the real fact of s.t.; imposter, quack” as in vb daġala; n. daġġalu = Aram.: Syr., Jp. daggel “to lie, deceive”. Another idea is “to cover”, a third idea is “to change the real appearance of a thing by giving it deceptively attractive or improved appearance, as *to coat with a thin layer of gold, of silver*, etc.

b) CA daġala “to cover” is from ġalā “to uncover, elucidate, make clear, reveal” also “to polish, burnish” (whence the opposite notion “give a deceptive appearance to s.t.” above); CIV ʾaġlā “make clear, clarify”, ġalāʾu “clarity, uncovering” = Phoen., OffAram, JAram. gly “to uncover, reveal” (NWSI I, 223), BHeb. gālā “to uncover; disclose, reveal”, BAram. gālā “to reveal” (OT, 192), Ge. ʾaglaya “faire découvrir”, Syr., Mand., Jp. gly “découvrir” (DRS III, 120; MD, 92). It seems that CA \*d- of dġl is a negative element (see §2.21.7 below). From stem \*gal also derive words in (c) and (b) below.

c) CA ʾaġlā masc. adj. “half-bald”; as a vb ġalā, said of the head “be half-bald”; maġālī pl. lit. “front places of the head where hair falls”, in BHeb. “be bald, naked” (OT, 192), from ‘clear up, shinning’: comp. CA ġalwāʾu fem. adj., said of the sky “free of clouds and rain”, said of the night, “shinning and free of clouds and rains”, etc.

d) Akk. galū, Phoen., BHeb., Aram. gly, CA CIV ʾaġlā “to migrate, emigrate, send into exile, drive away (people from their homeland)” (DRS III, *ibid.*; OT, *ibid.*), lit. *make bare a land of its inhabitants*.

e) Akk. dgl “to see, etc. above”: PHS stem [gal] as in CA CV ta-ġallā “to look at, come to view”; CVIII ʾiġtalā; n. ta-ġallī “sight, seeing” also, said of an eagle, “close and open the eyes to strengthen one’s ability to see” as in the PIP of Labid:

«...kaʾatīķi (ʾa)ṭ ʾairi yuṣḍī (*closing one’s eyes*) wa yuġal... (from *yu-ġallī*

“open one’s eyes”).

Eth. Har. tā-gēlāla “watch the movements of someone by stalking him” (HED, 71). The stem is also seen in [g-gl] (§2.17.83.29 below).

f) The stem [gal] is also seen with caus. š- (§2.2 below) and infixed /-n-/ in CA saḡanḡalu “mirror” = *making one see*. Apart from the fact that CA is fond of the affix /n/ (see §2.11), its presence here is apparently due to dissim.: \*saḡalḡalu, where the first /l/ dissimilating to /n/. For dissim., see §2.17.80 below.

### Comments

Based on the fact noted in §3.1.6.5.6 above, one may wrongly analyze Semitic [dgl] “to see” as a compound of (its distant cognate) \*dag- “to see” plus \*-l. For the time being, it may be sufficient to note that /d g l/ is a compound of \*d-, from da’ “cause”, \*g-, and \*-l. The last named element is linguistically identical with CA -l of [mḡl] “to see”. PHS stems \*dag-/ \*daḡ-/ \*-ḡal/ “see; eye” and many others will be studied in depth in §2.10.14 below.

It goes without saying that CA and Akk. use two different caus. prefixes: see §2.1.6.5.10 below.

**2.1.6.5.10** BHeb. dālaḡ “to burn, flame”; daleḡet “inflammation, fever”, BAram. dlḡ “to burn”, Jp. dēlaḡ id., Syr. dēlaḡ “to burn”; delḡā “flame, torch”, Mand. dlḡ “to kindle”. It is surprising to find that CA [dlḡ] does not express any idea related to those denoted by Heb.-Aram.

a) Heb.-Aram. [dlḡ] is orig. a compound of [da’] “make, cause” and a Semitic compound noun \*’alḡ- “glitter, shine” as in CA ’alḡu “a sparkling glitter or brightness”; ’alaḡa; ta’allaḡa “to glitter, or flash, and shine”, Assy. alāku “to shine”, Mand. aluka “flame” (OT, 226; DRS IV, 268; MD, 19).

b) To my understanding, their final \*-ḡ is linguistically identical with that of [ḡrḡ] “to burn” (CA ḡrḡ “to burn”, BAram. ḡrk “be burned, singed”, Heb. ḡārak, Syr. ḡrak id. (cf. Ryder 1973: 138, Rabin, 1975: 90, n. 12), of [brḡ] “to glisten, glitter, flash; lightning” (Assyr. barāḡu “to flash (of lightning); lightning”, BHeb. brḡ id.: cf. King, 1898: 340, etc.), of [ṣrḡ] “rise (sun), sun rise; east” (Sab. ṣrḡ “rise (star)”; mṣrḡ “slope exposed to sun, east”: cf. SD, 134, etc.), of [slḡ] below, etc. This phenomenon will be further studied in §2.2.51, n. b, under *Comments* below).

c) Unlike Aram. and Heb., CA prefers to use causative /ša-/ instead of \*da-. Thus CA real cognate is salaḡa, which *actually expresses a caus. meaning* “make burn (said of plants)”, a synonymous term is CIV ’aḡraḡa “make burn” from CI ḡaraḡa “to burn” above (LA). The verb also expresses “to boil (eggs, vegetable), to roast, scald”. It becomes quite obvious at this point that Heb.-Aram. [dlḡ] is a compound of \*d- “make” plus a stem [’alḡ] above, while CA [slḡ] is a compound of \*s- and a stem [’alḡ]. Many more of such correspondences will be brought to light in this study. See, for example, §3.1.13, n. 4 below.

**2.1.6.5.11** CA dayāṣa “to eat fully, eat/graze to excess; be fleshy, fat” < yaṣṣa “be choked with food or drink”; yaṣṣu “be very crowded with, full of to the extreme”; yaṣṣa;

CVIII 'iytašša “be overcrowded, congested, full (place, etc.)”.

**2.1.6.5.12** CA *dayalu*, *dāyila-tu* “hidden grudge, hidden rancor”; *'adyala* “to injure treacherously, assassinate, betray, slander”; *dayalu* “a very dense thicket of trees”, hence also “a place or anything one seeks to hide in it”; *dayilu*; *mud'yilu* “concealed, hidden” < *γillu* “grudge, rancor, fraud, enmity” as in the Koran (7: 43): (ونز عنا مافي صدورهم من غل); *γalla* “to betray, to fraud, steal stealthily”; *γālu* “hidden valley with trees”; *γalalu* “stream flowing between trees and in the valley (just mentioned) and is hardly seen” = [γyl] as in *γailu* “flowing stream or water” (= Sab. *γyl* “covered channel” also “to flow”: cf. SD, 54); *γīlu* = *dayalu* above, i.e. *a dense thicket of trees*, hence also “one can hide in it”; *γā'ila-tu* = *dāyila-tu* above, i.e. “hidden grudge, hidden rancor”; *'iytāla* “to assassinate, deceive”. In Sab. *yhyll-n* “to damage s.t.”: *γll* “fraudulently appropriate, withhold” = CA *γalla* id. as in Poet.:

«...ḡazā'u mu-*γillin* bi ('a)l 'amānati kāḏibu» (LA)

Also, Sab. *γll* “be angry (deity)”; *γlyt* “wrath” (SD, 53), Tham. *γl* “frauder” (Branden, 1950: 517), Chad.: Logone *γəla*, Buduma *hala* “to kill” (HSED, n. 1004) = CA CVIII *'iytāla* “assassinate” above.

It is clear that [da'] was added to two etymologically different stems: [γaW] “under, below” + \*-Wal “water”, which is the same \*-Wal in *sayl* “torrent of water” and many others. For the second stem, it will be sufficient for the time being to see §2.1.6.5.13 below.

**2.1.6.5.13** CA *dayala* above also denotes “to penetrate, enter into” < *γalla* id.; *ta-γalyala* “penetrate profoundly into”, OArām., OffArām., Hatra, etc. 'Il “to penetrate, to enter” (NWSI II, 855-857), etc.

**2.1.6.5.14** CA *dayiy* “of bad temper, evil morals; obscenity” as in the PIP of Ru'bah:

«...ḏā *dayawātin* ḡullaba ('a)l 'ahlāḳi».

This is from *γay* “deviation from the truth, corruption” as in the Koran (2: 256): (من الغي); *γiwāya-tu* “error, sin; erring, evil”; *γawā* “to err, go astray” as in the Koran (53: 2): (ما ضل صاحبكم وما غوى) and in the PIP of Durayd Bin Aṣ ṣammah:

«wa hal 'anā 'illā min *γaziyyata* 'in *γawa-t*

*γawai-tu* wa 'in *turšud* *γaziyyat* 'aršudi».

Other derivatives are *'uγwiya-tu* fem. “serious difficulty, calamity”; *ta-γāwī* “evil-doing”, Sab. *γwy* “grievous trouble”; *γwy-t* “harsh, exemplary punishment” (SD, 54), Egyp. 'w “sins, evil deeds” (EHD I, 114), BHeb., Arām. 'wy: see §2.1.14.3, n. 4a below.

**2.1.6.5.15** CA *du'suḳa-tu* fem. “intensely dark (night)” ← *'asaḳu* ~ *γasaḳu* “darkness”, defined as “beginning of night” (ŠHH IV, 1537): *γasā* “become dark (night)” (Al 'Ayn IV, 433).

**2.1.6.5.16** BHeb. *dāšēn* “to be or become fat”; *dāšēn* “fat, rich”; *dešen* “fatness, fat” (OT, 237). Its CA cognate preserves the root radical /-m-/ as in *dasima* “to be or become fat”; *dasimu* “fat, rich, greasy” (Rabin, 1975: 90, n. 26) < Akk. *šamanu*, *šamnu* “oil”,



BHeb. šāman ~ šāmēn “to be or become fat”; šemen “fatness; oil”, Syr. šumnō “fatness”, CA simanu, simna-tu “fatness”; samina “to be or become fat”.

**2.1.6.5.17** CA darraḳa “to flatter, cajole”, i.e. *make soft, soften the stiffness or rigidity of through the use of flattery* < raḳḳa “be soft, tender”.

**2.1.6.5.18** dahṣanu “harsh and rough (man), coarse” (Jamharah III, 1238) is evidently from haṣinu “rough, coarse”.

**2.1.6.5.19** CA quadriliteral [dyrḳ] as in dayraḳa “to pour out water so copiously and abundantly” or, simply and in a straightforward term, lit. “make one drown in water, wet all over”. It is semantically similar to CIV caus. ’ayraḳa < [yrḳ] as in yariḳa “to drown, sink into the bottom of a body of water” (AL ’Ayn IV, 354). The signification of [yrḳ] has been extended to ‘kill’ because the *midwife* used in pre-Islamic times *to drown a new born infant* in time of famine (ṢḤḤ IV, 1536), a practice was forbidden by Islam.

**3.1.6.5.20** Har. dālāḥa “sin, error, go astray”, Ms., Do. (tä-)dalla(m), S. tādālā, W. tādālā, Z. dālā id., Cush.: dil “sin, offence”: CA laḥyu ~ laḥwu “insulting, defaming”; laḥā’u “cursing”; laḥā “to insult, curse”, OAram. lḥy “bad, evil”, OffAram. lḥy “to do evil” (NWSI I, 571).

**2.1.6.5.21** CA da’aḍa [r. d’ḍ] expresses a causative meaning in the language “cause a vase to be filled (e.g. with water) as much as it can hold”: ’aḍḍa [r. ’ḍ] “to fill a vase (e.g. with water) as much as it can hold”. The verb da’aḍa, said of a man who has already eaten to the fullness, “make (or force) him eat (despite the fact that he is full of food)”. The same proot will also be seen in combination of another initial proot /ka-/ (see §2.17.83.14 below).

**2.1.6.5.22** CA da’afa [d’f] expresses *a causative meaning* in an explicit and unequivocal way “to kill”, i.e. {make + dead} also [df] in dafafa, dāffa id., [dfy] in dafā id.: \*-pa- “death; die”.

A certain suffix /-d/ can be suffixed to the same proot, hence fāda id. For other variants, see §2.11.29, esp. n. 5c and n. 6b below. This is the very same \*-fa- seen Semitic with caus. /s-/: see §2.20.5, n. 2 & n. 2a below.

**2.1.6.5.23** The same /-d/ is seen in numerous other trilaterals. Two additional examples may be CA *masada* “to move, go, or keep on going *at night*”. This example shows clearly that /-d/ became part of the root long after the adoption of m- as a third radical in HS [msy] “night, evening” (see §2.10.13 below). The example also shows that /-d/ is suffixed to a noun to convert it into a verb. For another example, see §2.1.6.5.24 below.

**2.1.6.5.24** The same [sy] “night” above, together with /-d/, is doubtless present in CA sa’ada “keep on walking or moving *the whole night*”; n. sa’du (Al ’Ayn, VII, 286) as in the PIP of Labid:

«yu-s'idu ('a)s sayru 'alayhā rākiba...».

Triliteral [s'd] seems to have come into existence much earlier than [msd] above. The earlier meaning or function of /-d/ will be determined as additional evidence is accumulated.

**2.1.6.5.25** We have seen in §2.1.6.5, n. 2e that Egyptian *d' wn* signifies “cause to be, exist”, and that its Semitic cognate is CA 'an-, preserved only in *old expressions* like «I don't do it *mā* (= as long as) 'anna (= be, exist) stars in the sky», *I don't do it as long as there are stars in the sky*, and «... *mā 'anna in the Euphrates a drop of water*», ... as long as be ~ exist a drop of water in the Euphrates, *I don't do it as long as there is a drop of water in the Euphrates* (LA, r. 'nn) = Cush.: Bil. en-, in- “to be”, Xamir an-, Kwara en- id., Saho in(n), -an-, Hadiya yon “to be” (HSED, n. 1069).

As a matter of fact, HS had a root [dn ~ dwn] “dwell, live in a place” seen in various HS language divisions, including Egyp, as we will see below. A question arises here: *is that root orig. a compound of d' + 'n “exist, be”?* There are a number of facts that should be elucidated before answering the question:

1) The two roots [dn] and [dwn] are not the only ones expressing “to dwell” in HS, there are, as a matter of fact, tens of other kindred roots expressing this notion, such as [m-dn] “city, town”, [tn-] “live, dwell”, [wṭn] “one's native country”, etc.<sup>25</sup>

2) HS languages also have a root [d' ~ t'] “ground, place, earth”:

2a) [d'] as in Cush.: Oromo da'oo “hiding place”, Iraqw do “house”, Alagwa do'o id., Chad.: Sokoro dā “house”, etc. see §2.3.25, n. 8 below.

2b) [t'] as in Egyp. t' “ground, land, earth, world” also “place” as in d' r t' “to land at a place”, Copt. to “earth”, Chad.: Lele tēy “earth”, Mwulyen teo “sand”, Bachama tiyey id., Cush.: Oromo taa'oo “fertile soil” (HSED, n. 2386).

3) Another fact should be brought to one's attention is that HS \*da'- can be used as a verb to express “to place, to set”.

4) If we assume that HS \*dn is from a noun [da'] “a place” plus a verb ['an] “to exist, be”, we will get an OV syntactic order. HS historical evidence does not strongly support this order. Moreover, this particular combination of [n. + vb] requires a preposition. The absence of the preposition suggests that the compound is orig. *a compound noun signifying “place of existence/residence”*, and that the same [da'] is present in HS dār as in Akk. dūr- “fortress, wall (of a city)”, CA “house + people who live in it + land surrounding it”, Heb., Aram. dwr “to dwell”, Mand. dawrā, Syr. dartā “habitation”, Talm. dūrā “district, village”, etc.

**2.1.6.6** Bin Faris recognizes a suffix /-l/ in CA as in *ḡaḥṣalu* “quick”, which includes a

---

<sup>25</sup> As in Egyp. dn-t “chamber, abode” (EHD II, 881), BHeb. [dwn] as in Gen. 6, 3 *my spirit shall not ḡḡ in man forever*. Most of the ancient versions give to the Heb. word the sense of ‘*remaining and dwelling*’, i.e. “shall not dwell” (OT, 218), in Syr. dn “to dwell”, CA CIV 'adanna “to dwell and remain in a place”, Chad.: Kabalay den “to dwell”, Ngamo ḡeno, id., Cush.: Saho, Afar diin “to sleep”, etc. see §2.12.20 below.

suffix /-l/ and is from *ġaḥṣu* id. (ML I, 510). Similarly, *ḡurāmilu*, said of a beast of burden, “bulky in figure” is from *ḡarmu* (ML V, 118), etc. Generally speaking, all old Arab scholars recognized a suffix /-l/ in a few word in the language. For example, they derived *ḡaysalu* “great number, plenty of” from *ḡaysu* id. and considered /-l/ as an *extra letter* without determining its function or meaning (LA).

1) The quadriliteral words cited thus far do not exist in SL, and for this reason I cannot determine with certainty the type of meaning that /-l/ adds to trilaterals [ġḥṣ] and [ṡys]. To me, however, the word *ġaḥṣal* leaves the impression that it is based on *ḡaḥṣ* masc. “donkey” (< CA *ġaḥṣu* masc.), and that its signification is by analogy with ‘*Abdūl* below, etc. should be “small or little donkey”. Further evidence can prove or disprove this intuitive impression.

2) CA *fayṣa-tu* and *fayṣala-tu* both fem. and signify “penis”. LA (r. fyṣ) says that: «/-l/ is added to [fyṣ] as the speakers add it to the proper names ‘*Abdalu* (‘*Abdu*) and *Zaidalu* (Zaidu)». Is /-l/ in these names *diminutive*? Frankly, I can’t tell. However, the name ‘*Abdūl* sounds ‘*diminutive*’ to me, just like other diminutive forms derived from the same name: ‘*Abbūd* & ‘*Ubaid*. It should be remembered, however, that ‘*impression*’ and ‘*sound like*’ are never evidence.

3) In searching for other examples that can prove or disprove the point, we find ‘*uḡbūlu*, cited by Bin Faris (ML IV, 360), which appears to contain a diminutive /-l/. It expresses «*some trace* (= lit. remainder) of sickness”: «*is, in effect, a (mild) sickness that follows the serious (lit. great) sickness*»: ‘*uḡbu*, BHeb. ‘*ēḡeb*, BAram. ‘*īḡbā* “the end”. Unlike Bin Faris, LA treats /-l/ as part of a quadriliteral [‘ḡbl], and the word ‘*uḡbūlu* also expresses “little scab on the lip (from previous sickness)”. The same definition was earlier cited by Jawhari (ṢḤḤ V, 1772). It can thus be said that /-l/ in this word is definitely a suffix, but it may or may not be *diminutive*.

4) Another word seems to include a suffix /-l/ is *ḡu’būlu* “cup”, perhaps originally “small cup” < *ḡa’bu* (\**ḡu’bu*) “large cup”, and consists of at least four proots, to be defined later (see §2.17.83.17 below).

5) The word ‘*ansalu* “fast she-camel” (Jamharah II, 1156) or “fast vigorous she-camel” (Al ‘Ayn II, 330) also seems to have a suffix /-l/. The word is, according to Abu Haiyān (quoted by Siyūṭi in Muzhir II, 259), formed from ‘*ansu*, “a strong and firm she-camel” by means of the suffix /-l/. It appears that ‘*ansu* orig. meant “a she-camel in its middle age”: comp. ‘*ānisu* “an unmarried woman in her middle age”, and that ‘*ansalu* = “young she-camel”. Consider the following verse of A’sha, a PIP poet.:

«wa ḡad ‘aḡṡa’u (‘a)l ḡauza, ḡauza (‘a)l falāt,

bi (‘a)l lḡurra-ti ‘al bāzili (‘a)l ‘*ansali*». (LA, r. ‘nsl).

The word *bāzil*- “having an eyetooth” in the phrase «*bāzili* ‘*ansali*» above: *bazala*, said of a camel or she-camel’s eyetooth, “to emerge”, usu. *around the age of eight or nine*<sup>26</sup>.

<sup>26</sup> The common form used in SL for “to emerge (a baby’s tooth)” is *nabaz* [nbz], sometimes *bazz* (as in *bazzu snēnū* (= CA ‘*asnāna*-hu “his teeth”). CA [nbz] expresses “to call each other by nicknames” as in the Koran: (ولا تتابزوا بالألقاب), *Nor call you one another by nick names* (49:11). Koranic *tanābazū* is commonly pronounced in SL *tanābaḏū* and **natively** understood as being from [nbḏ]. The verb *nabaḏa* signifies in CA “to throw s.t. away; outcast, etc.” and so does in SL.

6) Some other examples include /-l/ are faḥḡaḡu “lameness, crookedness in the legs or feet” → faḥḡalu “lame”, hidmu → hidmilu “worn out garment”, harḡu → harḡalu both signify “commotion, disorder”, n’d → n’dl “calamity”, nahaša “to bite (usu. from a distance) and to leave a mark on the bitten person but without wounding him”; nahšala expresses a lesser degree of ‘biting’, i.e. *the way a person bites a girl he loves*.

Old Arab scholars consider /-l/ of ‘ansal- above as *an extra letter*, and admit that this /-l/ can be suffixed to nouns and also to verbs as in *ḡaṣmala* “to break” from *ḡaṣama* id. They wrongly identify it with etymologically different /l’s/ such as /-l-/ of ḡālika: ḡāka “that” (LA r. lwu). For the signification of this particular /-l-, see §2.20.3 below.

7) The suffix is also seen in some other Semitic languages as in BHeb. ḡrs “a joint, curve”: ḡrsl “a small joint, joint, ankle” (OT, 945), karmel “garden land”: cf. BHeb. kerem, CA karmu, Eth. kerm, Syr. karmā “vine yard”. Moscati (1969: §12.21) tends *«to identify independent patterns with suffix -l»* and Gray (1971: §174) conjectures that the word *«may be of pre-Semitic origin, and deformed by popular etymology»*.

8) In conclusion, there is no doubt that \*-l was used in CA and its sister languages as a suffix, and that the function of this suffix was, as indisputable evidence will show below, *diminutive*.

8a) Indubitable evidence proving that /-l/ was used as ‘diminutive’ comes from CA as in *ḡarmu* “full-grown male of camels”, used for fecundation (LA, r. ḡrm), cited by Bin Faris above. Its meaning may extend to ‘man’, esp. *in poetry*, with the signification “magnified master or lord” > *ḡirmilu* masc. “little or small camel”. Possible cognates are Cush.: Ga., Som. korma “male”, Amh. korma “steer”, Har. korma “male animal” (HED, 94).

8b) Another type of conclusive evidence comes from the discovery that Hamito-Semitic had a proot [-b-] denoting “male” (often of animals): see §2.23.6 below. Consider the following example:

CA *haiḡalu* or *hiḡlu* is defined as ‘young of an ostrich’ (Al ‘Ayn III, 367). The morphological structure of the word includes two morphemes: *a free morpheme* \*hiḡ- signifying “female ostrich”: cf. CA *haiḡu* id., and *a bound morpheme* \*-l. Now, to form a new word denoting “male ostrich”, just add the ‘male suffix [-b]’ to it, hence hiḡbu “male of ostrich”. At this point, the reader, like my hesitant mind, rightly asks: *can’t we assume that [hiḡ] signifies “ostrich” independently of the notion of ‘sex’, and that proots [-l] and [-b] are added to \*hiḡ- to specify ‘female ostrich’ and ‘male ostrich’ respectively?* See §2.23.6 below.

To sum up, there is no doubt that \*-l/ was a suffix expressing as evidence alone suggests *a diminutive meaning*. Its *primeval* meaning, however, is difficult to determine with certainty.

---

According to Lahyāni, mu-nābaḡa-tu = “throwing to somebody your garment and he will in return throw his to you” also “throwing each other with a stone” (LA). From here comes the Koranic word above ‘throw one another with nick names or bad names’ > call one another by nick names, i.e. *bad names*.

**2.1.6.7** Bin Faris's work also draws attention to the former presence of suffixed /-r/ in CA, later becoming part of the root in most of its occurrences. For example, 'ukbara-tu, fem. "rude (woman)" is from 'akabu "rudeness" (ML IV, 362). Another example is 'aisaġūru "rapid she-camel" < 'asaġa-t (-t = it, referring to 'she-camel) "hastens"; 'āsiġu adj. = 'aisaġūru in meaning (ML IV, 363). It seems that the part of speech of the derivative in question is 'adjective', hence, also 'ukbara-tu = 'akbā-'u adj. id. (both suffixes /-tu/ and /-'u/ are fem.).

1) I have found a few examples in which /-r/ being recognized as a suffix by old Arab scholars. Of such examples, I may cite *dimθaru* "soft or fine (land)" also "gentle, good-natured" < *damiθu* "gentle, good-natured" also "soft or fine (land)". Similarly, *damθara-tu* and *damātha-tu* express an identical meaning "gentleness, kindness".

Instead of studying the above pairs of words in an attempt to determine the morphological function of /-r/, most old Arab scholars preferred to count the number of radical consonants in each word and classified the word accordingly. Thus, to Ibin Jinni (Khaṣā'iṣ II) *sabiṭu* and *sibṭaru* "tall, stretching; extension" belong to two different roots, the first of three radicals [sbṭ] and the second of four [sbṭr], and the same classification holds true for *ḥabiġu* ~ *ḥibaġru* "fat, swell" (p. 49), *ḍabayṭā* = *ḍabayṭarā* "a word (like bu-'u = "bogy" in signification) used to frighten children" (pp. 55, 146). A variant form *ḍaba'ṭarā* id. exists (LA).

2) The substance *ḫubṭuriy* "white clothes", containing a suffix /-r/ followed by /-iy/ "belonging to, source from" (for this suffix, see §3.6 below). The word *ḫubṭu* is from Copts, i.e. *Egyptians*, who were famous in making such clothes. The prefix \*-r- seems to have the same function as /-r/ in words discussed so far. Its meaning is definitely "belonging to", like the common HS /-iy/ ending (see §3.6 below). My view here is that as the suffix /-r/ ceased to be felt as having the power of expressing 'belonging to' in CA (cf. §2.1.14.2, *Comments* II), the word \*ḫubṭuru took by analogy the additional ending /-iy/, thus it is a double *nisba* نسبة. The CA suffix -r is from PHS \*-r-, which is seen as an independent word in Egyp. *r*, *yr* "belonging to" as in *r pr* "belonging to the house" (*pr* = "house": cf. EHD I, 415).

The very same /r/ is often a suffix in CA, though examples of prefixed /r/ as in Egyp. are not rare, e.g. **rāġinu** [r. rġn], consisting of \*r- "belonging to" and \*ġin "house", and its meaning is "belonging to the house" = *dāġin* (see §2.1.6.5.5 above), with a slight difference in meaning, which results from the difference in meaning and use between [d-] and [r-]. The word **dāġin**, said of a domestic animal, "causing itself to become accustomed to the house or to someone, making it accustom to the house", while **rāġin** "belonging to the house, a member of the house". This is, to my knowledge, **one of the purist and most obvious examples of /r-/ performing this function in the language.** The use of /r/ here is linguistically identical with that of Egyp. in *r pr* "belonging to the *pr* = house above.

3) Among other words including suffixed -r, Bin Faris cites *ġa'baru* "short" (also *ġa'bariyyu*: cf. LA, r. [ġ'b]) "short" < *ġu'bu* "short" (ML I, 510), *ḫamṭarīru* "strong", formed from *ḫamaṭu*, and *the /-r/ was doubled or repeated, according to Bin Faris, to strengthen the meaning* (ML V, 117). In my opinion, the word contains, at least, three suffixes: one is -r (*ḫamṭaru*), the second -iy (*ḫamṭariy* or *ḫamṭarī*) and the third -r

(*ḳamṭarīru*, i.e. *ḳamṭariyru*, upon the loss of \*-y- the preceding vowel /i/ was lengthened). *I can add a fourth suffix -iy and pronounce the word ḳamṭarīriy, without any change of meaning.* This phenomenon has already been explained above (see *ḳubṭuru*). The trilateral [ḳmṭ] expresses in BHeb., BAram. “to lay fast hold of” (OT, 929), etc. = CA ḳmṭ “to take; thief” also “to bind”.

4) In some cases, the derived quadrilateral exists, but its trilateral base does not, as, for example, *ḍaġḥara* “to fill with water” with no other derivatives. The word is from \*ḍaġʾara and the voiced pharyngeal changed into /-ḥ/, i.e. *its voiceless counterpart*, upon the addition of /-r/ since one can’t pronounce \*ḍaġʾara<sup>27</sup>. Hence, ḍaġiʾa-tu fem., said of a bucket, pail, “full of water” as in Poet.:

«...ḍāġiʾa-tun taʾdilu maila (ʾa)d daffi» (LA).

It seems that final /-r/ in this example is etymologically different from the other /-r/ discussed so far. It is identical with /-r/ in SL naʾfar “to scatter all over or in all directions”: naʾaf “to scatter”.

5) The following carefully selected examples from Egyp. attempt to demonstrate the previous existence of a bound morpheme /-r/, later becoming a part of the root in all Hamito-Semitic languages.

5a) swr “to drink” < sw “a drink, to drink” (EHD II, 648, 651): see §2.8.12 below.

5b) npr “seed, corn, grain” < np, npʾ-t, npy “corn, grain” (EHD I, 368-369), also pr-t “seed, corn, grain, wheat” (EHD I, 242-243). *What is the proot here and how can we precisely locate it?* Note that [bur] is the gen. Hamito-Semitic term for “grain”. The reader will find the answer by himself in the course of this research.

5c) bkr “steps, stairs” < bk “ladder, steps” (EHD I, 225).

5d) dhʾr “terrible, frightening” < dh “to strike, beat” (EHD II, 887).

5e) nmr “steering pole, paddle” < nmy “to travel by boat, to sail, to float” < nm “to bathe, to swim”: nm “lake” (EHD II, 372-373).

5f) dʾr “to measure” < dʾ “a measure, weigh out” (EHD II, 895, 899).

5g) ḥwr “be poor, miserable, wretched, to beg” *results from* ḥw “to lack, be in want”

6) Examples of suffixed /-r/, like those of Egyp, are abounded in Semitic languages as the following examples may show:

6a) BHeb. tāʾar “to be marked out or off, to be described”, e.g. *a border, boundary; Piel*. “to mark out, to delineate”: tāw “a mark, sign” (OT, 1093, 1097), CA tiwā(ʾ) “a mark like a cross on the cheeks, thighs, or necks of animals (horses, camels)”.

6b) Similar examples are CA šaḥā ~ šaḥara “open the mouth”, ḳašā ~ ḳaššara “to strip off the bark, peel, skin, pare”; ma-ḳšū ~ ma-ḳšūru “peeled, skinned” (ŠHH VI, 2462; LA), ḡubā (or ḡabā) ~ ḡubār “dust”, ḥašā “to stuff, to cram” as in ḥašā *a pillow*, ḥašā *an animal skin in order to restore its natural form*, ḥašā a chicken, turkey, vegetable (e.g. squash), with another type of food, etc.; ḥašara “to huddle, crowd, gather together, press

<sup>27</sup> Some examples illustrating the interchange of /ʾ/ and /ḥ/ in CA are baʾṯara ~ baḥṯara “to scatter all over, to squander”, ʾarā-hu ~ ḥarā-hu “near him”, waʾā ~ waḥā “sound”, ʾandā ~ ḥandā (~ ḥandā) “to use obscene language”, dabaʾa ~ dabaḥa, (Amāli II, 68; LA; Siyūṭi’s Muzhir I, 466), ḳāʾifu ~ ḳāḥifu “rain sweeping everything before it” (LA), ṣawwaʾa ~ ṣawwaḥa “to disperse” (LA), maʾasa ~ maḥasa “to rub and tan hides” (LA), ḳilḥam ~ ḳilʾam “aged man” (Al ʾAyn II, 301), etc. However, what we call *interchange of /ʾ/ and /ḥ/ or of /ʾ/ and /ʾ/* may often be due to other causes (see, for example, §2.22.2, n. d below).

together (e.g. people, animals, etc.) in a very narrow place” as in the Koran: (جميعا) *The Day when we shall gather them all (the whole of mankind) together* (6: 22)

6c) The word *ḡadd*, pronounced 'add in SL since /ḡ/ is regularly /ʾ/, signifies “the measure of, the size of, of equal (size, amount, measure, etc.)”. By suffixing /-r/, we get a trilateral [ḡdr] as in CA *ḡadru* “size, amount”, with prep. 'alā = on {ʾalā ḡadri} “the measure of, the size of, of equal (size, measure, etc.)”; CII *ḡaddara* “to estimate, value, reckon; measure”, dial. CII 'addar id.: CI 'adar “make a measurement of”. We may note that the difference between SL [ʾd] and [ʾdr] lies in the fact that [ʾd] *can't be used as a verb at all*. This implies that [ʾdr] is a compound of [ʾd] and [ʾr], and that the signification of [ʾr] may be “making, performing” > “to make, do, perform”: cf. Egyp. 'ry “make, do, form, create, fashion” (EHD I, 64), Chad.: Gwandara ra “to become”, Bokkos ro “to work”, Lame re, rey “to become, to build”, Dangla orriye “to become”, riyo “to work, make”, Cush.: Asa ra' “to stay, remain” (HSED, n. 2077): CA 'ariya “to work, do, make” also “stick to, stay, dwell”. In following my conviction that the origin of a word is the noun and never the verb, the oldest meaning of [ʾar] is “one who makes, does, forms, creates, deals with, belongs to”. This makes the grammatical function of [ʾar] similar to (though not identical with) that of /-y/ (see §2.6 below). One suggestive example may be Egyp. ḡw “to lack, be in want” > ḡwr “be poor, to beg” (n. 5g above).

## 7) Comments

7a) Prefixed /r/ will be treated in subchapter §2.15 below. It is sufficient for the time being to give a brief account of a different prefix /r-/, which appears as if it were a passive or reflexive prefix.

7b) Bin Faris (ML II, 340) correctly derives *darbasa* “to advance, go forward” from [rbs] as in 'irbassa “to go”. There is, however, another etymologically different *darbas*<sup>28</sup>.

7c) It is indisputable that [rbs] is from [bs] as in CA *bassa*, said of domestic animals, “to send them out to pasture and they will spread (be scattered) all over” also “to travel or wander about on the face of the earth, go, drive (animals) gently” = Egyp. bs “to advance, pass on, come” (EHD I, 222), and that [bs] is variant of [bθ] as in baθθa id. (Jamharah III, 1724) also “to spread, disperse, to divulge”, Ug. bθ id., Sab. bθ “proclaim” (DRS II, 91).

7d) As a matter of fact, /r-/ is not the only bound morpheme added to [bs]. There are other affixes added to the root to express certain grammatical meanings. The /n-/ was prefixed to [bs] first to derive, as we should expect, a reflexive CVII stem (ʾi)nbassa (see §2.1.7.3, n. 7 below), later becoming permanently attached to the root, hence [nbs].

As [nbs] established itself on a firm ground as a new root in the language, another PHS prefix, namely causative /š/ (as in Akk., Ug., Egyp., etc. > CA /s-/: see §2.2 below), has been added to [nbs] as in sanbasa id. = CIV causative 'anbasa id. of nabasa. The caus. prefix \*s- was first used interchangeably with its CA equivalent /ʾ-/ (§2.3

<sup>28</sup> The word exists in SL as well as in other dialects as an adj. m-darbis “one who is fat and very short”. Its /-r-/ is an infix becoming permanently attached to the root. It is clearly from [d-] plus CA [bs] “debase, belittle” (see §2.3.48, n. a below).

below), later, as its use began to decline rapidly, speakers became increasingly unaware of its ‘original function’, ultimately attaching it to the already established trilateral [nbs], hence [snbs]. It is to be stressed here that some Old Arab scholars were only aware that /s-/ is a prefix. LA (r. nbs] quoted Abu Omar Zāhid as saying:

«/s-/ of *sanbasa* is a prefix, and that this /s/ is one of the extra letters in the language».

Is /r-/ of *'irbassa* an old reflexive, a passive prefix or a variant form of the reflexive passive /n-/, which forms CVII stems as in *'indassa* CVII of *dassa* “be inserted”, *'inkabba* CVII of *kabba* “be thrown”, *'inṣabba* CVII of *ṣabba* “be poured out”, *'inballa* CVII of *balla* “be wet”, and so forth?

As a matter of fact, CVII *'inbassa* is found in the language, and Al-Laḥyāni alone derived it from *bassa* “to go”, while other scholars considered it a mere variant of *'irbassa* (LA, r. bss). Another important point concerned with ‘ease of pronunciation’ should be noted here, it is much easier to pronounce *'inbassa* than *'irbassa*. In the light of this fact one may wonder why this form has been kept in the language? Older *'irbaθθa* arch. is even much more difficult to pronounce.

A similar example is [rmd] as in *'armaḏa* [r. rmd] “to hurt” is from *maḏḏa* [r. md] as in *maḏḏa*(ni = me), CIV *'amaḏḏ-ni* lit. “it causes pain to me, hurts me” as in Poet.

«faḵnī wa ṣarru (ʿal) ḵaulu mā *'amaḏḏā*» (LA).

Another derivative is *maḏḏu* “penetrating pain, hurt” = *'irmāḏu* “anything that hurts”, hence *ramḏū* “very intense heat”, *ramiḏa*, said of one’s feet, “be burned from intense heat”. For additional information on [md] and its ultimate origin, see §2.10.25, n. 1a and n. 1b below.

To sum up, the evidence set forth above is still up to this moment insufficient to lay a claim that prefixed /r-/ is a purely passive prefix. This same /r-/ will also be studied in connection with its Egyp. cognate /r-/ in §2.11.6, n. 3 below in order to determine its earlier meaning or function with certainty. In addition and as mentioned above, there will be a subchapter dedicated for this prefix (§2.15 below).

**2.1.6.8** Bin Faris, like *some other old Arab scholars*, recognizes a suffix /-k/ in CA, but without determining its meaning or function. For example, he derives *habraka*-tu fem., “soft, fine, tender” from *habaru* “a lump of meat or flesh so tender with no fat or bone” (ML VI, 71). He considers *ṣummaliku* “strong” as being from *ṣumullu* (ML III, 351), *ḏibrāku* “bulky, strong” as being from *ḏabru* id. (ML III, 401) ~ *ḏibru* id., etc. Abu Maṣṣūr (in LA, r. zwn) *rightly considers* *zawannaku* “one who struts” as being from *zawannu* id., and its /-k/ is an extra letter in the language.

a) As for CA *habaru* above, it is related to *habara* “to cut meat or flesh”, BHeb. *hābar* “to cut, cut up”, etc.: PHS stem [bar] “to cut” as in BHeb. *bārā(h)* id., CA *barā* “to cut off, cut out”, etc.<sup>29</sup>

b) Bin Faris’s view on the above-mentioned suffixed /-k/ is correct. Among a number of obvious examples that can be cited to support this view is SL *fanak* “annihilate all”

<sup>29</sup> Of all words cited above only *habar* is in use in SL and expresses an identical meaning. The suffix -k may add *having the characteristics of habar*, i.e. *soft, tender*. This is perh. from the HS [ka] “like, as”: see §2.20.11.



from *fanā* “to annihilate”: CA *fanā* id. with *fanaka*, often said of food, “to eat all”, lit. *to keep on eating until you finish it all*, said of any matter, “to persist in pursuing it until you catch up with”. It is quite obvious that [-k] here signifies ‘all’, and that this same meaning was probably assigned to it by some old Arab scholars as we will see in §2.20.5, n. 1b below. This particular /-k/ is definitely not the same as that cited by Bin Faris in the words above. The signification of that /-k/ is, intuitively speaking, very closely related to that of prefixed /k-/: see §3.17.83 below.

**2.1.6.9** Bin Faris (ML V, 117) correctly derived *ḳudmūsu* “master, lord” and “old, ancient” from *ḳidamu* “oldness”. Hamito-Semitic compound [ḳdm] is discussed at length in §2.19.4 below, and the word given here is a compound of at least four different proots. For what concerns final -s, it seems to have a number of different meanings and grammatical functions. One of its obvious functions in Hamito-Semitic is *causative*, and this function will be dealt with in subchapter §2.2 below.

I am more concerned here with notion “old” as expressed by the word than with “master”. It should be kept in mind, however, that there is a very close connection between ‘old’ and ‘master, chief (of a tribe, clan)’; the *oldest in the family, clan, or tribe is its reference and representative*. Among terms from the language demonstrating this close relationship is *šāḥa* “to age, grow old” (= Egyp. š’h’ “the approach of death”): *šaiḥu* “chief of a tribe, of a community”. An old man who approaches ‘death’ may refer to as either *šāḥ* or, using two synonymous words, *šāḥ wa* (= and) *harim* (= grow old).

1) Some examples showing the former presence of a suffix -s in CA and its sister languages.

1a) CA [ḡd] “be dry, dry” > *gādisu* adj. “dry”.

1b) CA \*ḳa’- “to lie down, sit” (§§2.4.7, 2.4.8, 2.7.7 and 2.12.28 below) > [ḳ’s] as in *ḳa’wasu* “old man”; *ḳa’su* “fixity, stability, steadiness, lasting”; *’aḳ’asu*, said of the night, “long + steady”, lit. *it looks like it does not want to leave its place* (ML V, 110).

1c) CA *ḳarnu* “horn” (gen Sem. *ḳrn* id.) also “small mountain” > [ḳrns] as in *ḳurnāsu* lit. “overlooking part (lit. ‘nose’) of a mountain, protruding part of a mountain”.

1d) CA *ḳariḳu* “plain, flat place” > *ḳarḳūsu* id., but often used as adj. “flat, even” (ML V, 118, also see LA).

1e) CA [dl’] as in CVII *’indala’a*, said of a man, “be big-bellied” > *dal’asu* ~ *dal’aṯu* also *dal’aku* (for suffixed -k, see §2.1.6.8 above) “bulky (camel)”.

1f) CA *nuḳra-tu* (adj. *naḳiru*, vb *naḳira*) “a kind of malady occurs in the hooves and thighs of sheep and goats” > *niḳrisu* “a kind of malady occurs in the legs or in joints”.

1g) [’tl] as in *’aiṯalu* “tall” → [’tʃls] in *’aṯallasu* id.

1h) HS \*ḳur- n. “cold” as in Akk. *ḳirru*, CA *ḳurru* (~ less common *ḳirru*), BHeb. *ḳor*, Syr. *ḳurā* id.: Cush.: Oromo *ḳorra* “intense cold”, Sidamo *ḳorre* n. “cold”, Chad.: Housa *kararā* id. > CA *ḳārisu* adj. “cold, chilly”, JAram., Syr. *ḳrš*, Mand. *ḳurša* “cold, freezing”, Berb: *Tua yeres* “freeze”.

1i) CA *ḥamma* “to heat, flame up; burn”, etc. gen. HS id. (§2.2.6 below) > *ḥamīsu*<sup>30</sup>

<sup>30</sup> SL *ḥimiš* is obviously from *ḥāmi* “hot” + -š used only as adj. with no vb form.

“oven”; ḥamisa “become hot” ~ ḥammaṣa<sup>31</sup> “to toast (bread), Chad.: Daba mēsa “to roast”.

lj) Akk. bābu, OArām. byb’ “infant, baby” (DRS II, 40), Chad.: Mubi bobu “son”, Cush.: Oromo baabu “child” (HSED, n. 166) > CA bābūs “baby, infant”. To the same root belongs SL bibēnē fem. (\*bibāna-h < \*bibāna-tu) “the smallest species of a bird”, and its final -nē is linguistically identical with that of ’insēnē fem. “human being” (< CA ’insāna-tu id.). *The term is also seen without /-s/ in CA baba-tu* “sound uttered by a baby” also “young boy”.

lk) CA [fṭṭ] in ’afṭṭu, [fṭ’] in ’afṭa’u = ’afṭasu [fṭs] “flat nosed, snub-nosed” = Egyp. [fnd] ~ [fnt], with infixed /-n-/, “nose”. The Egyp. infix /-n-/ is also seen in CA [fntṣ] fntṣu “tip of the nose, nose (of a pig)”. One can replace /-n-/ with /-r-/ to create a new quadrilateral, hence firṭṣu.

ll) CA salisu “ease” (from “stealth”), treated as being a root [sls] in some CA dictionaries like ML, ṢḤḤ, and LA, but in *earlier dictionaries* (Al ’Ayn; Tahḏīb) as being from [sl].

lm) CA sīsā’ “back (of a donkey or mule) also “vertebras of the back”. The word is clearly a compound of \*sī- and [sa’] back”. Its Egyp. cognate is [s’] “back, hinder parts” as a vb “to turn the back in flight, to flee” (EHD II, 633), with prep. [m]: m s’ “at the back of, after, behind”. The proot [sa’] is seen in a number of compound trilaterals such as Sem. [ms’], [ns’], etc.: see §2.10.44 below.

ln) CA ’ara-n-da-su: see §2.1.6.4 above.

2) Some carefully selected examples from other HS languages are:

2a) BHeb. ḥeres “the sun”. The CA cognate is ḥarasu “time, old” above: HS stem [ḥar] (see §2.2.32 below).

2b) Egyp. ḥḳ “to capture” (EHD I, 512) > ḥḳs “a bird-catcher, a fisherman” (EHD I, 514).

2c) Egyp. ḥ’bī ~ ḥbī “to keep a festival” > ḥ’bs ~ ḥbs “a festival” (EHD I, 462, 474),

2d) Egyp. bg “weak, feeble, exhausted, helpless” > bgs “be weak or miserable” ~ bgs-t “feebleness, weakness, helplessness” (EHD I, 225-226).

2e) Egyp. dny-t “a measure” > dnys “heavy, burdensome”; dns “to be loaded heavily; weight, burden, heavy” (EHD II, 882-883). But, there are cases in Egyp. (also in CA) where we find /s/ used to form verbs from substances as, for example, Egyp. nd “little, something small” > nds “to become small or little, be little” (EHD I, 411, 413). The possibility that this /-s/ is an old variant of PHS caus. \*š- (see §2.2 below) cannot be dismissed.

### Comments I

It does not seem to be scientific to close this section without recording the following important observation: *many roots whose final radical is /-s/ (~ /ṣ/; for the interchange of /s/ and /ṣ/, see §2.2.48 below) denote “reversal, opposite, upside down”* as in ’aks id., as a vb ’akasa “to reverse, turn upside down, to *turn the end of s.t. to its beginning*”, said of a domestic animal “to tie its head to its chest (or to tie its head to its back) and leave it

<sup>31</sup> Another derivative is ḥamṣīṣ “a kind of sour plant” = [ḥmz] “sour” are both variants of [ḥmd] “sour; be sour, acid” = BHeb. ḥmṣ “be sour, acid, leavened”, in Syr. “be sour” (OT, 325).

as such until it dies” also “to draw its head with a rope and force it to go backward”, *'afsu* “to turn back the head of animal to its chest” (Al ‘Ayn I, 340), *nakasa* “to reverse, turn upside down” also “to diminish, undervalue”; *ma-nkūs* “reversed, inverted, upside down”, *wakasa* “to diminish, undervalue”, *makasa* id., *ḡalasa* “as the food ejected from the stomach reaches the mouth it comes back to the stomach”, hence also “to spew”, perh. from *laḡsu* “nausea” (note that \*lks is impermissible for *seq. const.*), *'akbasa* ~ *'akmasa* “tie the neck (of an animal) to one of its leg”. Nearly all such trilaterals also express “shrink or diminish”.

## Comments II

An important Hamito-Semitic root ending with the above-mentioned /-s/ is [rks] in CA *raksu* “turning s.t. upside down”, defined as “*turning the beginning of s.t. to its end*” (Al ‘Ayn V, 310), apparently the antonym of [ʿks] above, as verbs CI *rakasa*, CIV *'arkasa*, CVIII *'irtakasa* as in the Koran: (والله أركسهم بما كسبوا), *God has reversed them for what they have earned* (4: 88).

In all other sister languages [rks] expresses to “bind” as in Ug. *rks* id. (UG, 530), Assy. *rakāsu* id.; *markasu* “bolt (of a door)” (SL *raksī* “a solid piece of wood, timber, used chiefly to close the door firmly”); *riksu* “bond, band” (King, 1898: 385), perh. = CA *riksu* “bridge”, i.e. *one that connects, binds* (perh. *the beginning of s.t.* (a place, bank, etc.) *to the end of s.t. else*, i.e. *the other side of a bank, place, etc.*, BHeb. *rākas* “to bind on or to any thing”; *rākāsīm* pl. “bound-up places”, e.g. *mountain ranges, chains of mountains*; *rōkes* in *rukāsī* ʾīš (Ps. 31, 21) may denote “bands or troops of men” (OT, 980) = CA *riksu* “group of men, bands” (also see *kirsu* below), Egyp. *rksw* “a yoke (of horses)” (EHD I, 435), CA *rikāsu* “noose, cord”.

By shifting the order of radicals [rks], we get gen. Berb. [krs] “to tie” (Prasse, 1975: 227) and CA *karasa* “to join one (part) to another (part of a thing), to bind together (parts of a thing)”; *kirsu* “group, band (of people or of anything)”.

It is important to note that Semitic [rks] “tie, bind” has been preserved intact in CA in compounds. See, for example, §2.17.83 below.

It is possible that Hamito-Semitic once had a syllable \*/kas/ expressing “reversal, etc.”: CA *kauwasa* “to reverse, turn upside down” (Al ‘Ayn, 392)<sup>32</sup>, *kus'u* “posterior part (of people)” also “after” (Al ‘Ayn V, 393). It seems to me that \*-s and not \*-k expresses “backward, reverse”. Any further analysis of this particular trilateral in this section will hardly be comprehensible and thus a waste of time since a final word on its ultimate origin requires a new discovery. For this reason, It will be re-examined in §2.17.83.12 below.

Based on the data set forth above, *intuition tells that /-s/ expresses ‘one or a thing & its opposite’*: reread the meanings expressed by CA words above, esp. that of *rakasa*.

7) To sum up, PHS had a bound morpheme \*-s other than the caus. \*s. This troublesome morpheme seems to have accrued a number of different functions and meanings in the course of time. In addition to all examples cited thus far, I add the

<sup>32</sup> Chad.: Kabalay *kusu* “to turn”, Musgum *kasa* “to fall”, etc.

following two:

7a) CA [f'y] in 'af'ā "viper, adder" (§2.3.27 below) > CA [f's] in CA fā'ūsa-tu fem. id.

7b) CA fa' - in compounds "fire": cf. Egyp. p' "fire" > CA [f's] in fā'ūsu id. It seems evident that final -s here is derivational.

**2.1.6.10** For what concerns 'blending', I will select, as illustrations, only *three* out of many blends, owing to the fact Bin Faris' views and mine disagree on the origins of nearly all the blends he dealt with.

a) *karbala-tu*, a deficiency disease characterized by the inability to stand on the feet (called *rakhāwatu*, i.e. rickets) < a blend of *rabala* + *kabala* (ML V, 193). The word sounds to me as if 'one was *mu-kabbalu*', i.e. 'fettered', 'girded', hence, 'unable to move'.

The quadriliteral is from *kabbala* "to shackle, to fetter", with the first /-b-/ dissimilating to /-r-/ (for identical instances, see §2.17.80 below): CA *kabbala*, Akk. *kabālu* "to fetter", etc. (MD, 405). The same infix is also found in BHeb. *mə-kurbāl* "girded" < *mə-kubbāl* id. (OT, 487).

b) *hibrikiyyu* "goldsmith": *habraḡa* "make glitter, shine" was analyzed by Bin Faris (ML VI, 71) as a blend of *habara* "to cut" and *baraḡa* "to glitter, flash". The initial h- is a Semitic caus. prefix equivalent to /'-/ as in *ha-rāḡa* ~ 'a-rāḡa "to pour out", etc. (§2.4 below), thus 'abraḡa, said of the sky or lightning, "to flash, glitter", lit. "cause itself to flash", Akk. *barāḡu* "to flash (of lightning), to blast"; *birḡu*, BHeb. *bārāḡ*, Ug. *brḡ*, etc. "lightning" (DRS II, 86). As for final -y (yu) (= *yā'* 'an-nisbah: see §2.6 below) "belonging to, having to do with + meaning of the word".

c) Bin Faris' analysis of 'iblandaḡa "be widen" (ML I, 330) as a blend of *badāḡu* "far-stretched land" and *baladu* "open space" is also wrong. The word is from [bdḡ] in *badāḡu* "far-stretched land"; *ta-baddaḡa* "to become/be wide, to expand", and its infix /-lan-/ is linguistically identical with that of 'islanḡaḡa (see §2.2.39 below). Among other variant trilaterals and quadrilaterals with voiceless /\*p/ are *faḡaḡa* "be wide" and, with infixes /l & r/, *faḡaḡa* and *farḡaḡa* "be wide, large, flat".

The foregoing analysis of trilaterals and quadrilaterals suggests that they all share with the trilateral [pḡḡ] "to open" the same origin. The trilateral [pḡḡ] is by far the most common HS root expressing "to open" as in OAkk. *pt'* "to open" (Gelb, 1961: 190), Ug. *ptḡ* id. (UG, 534), Phoen., Pun., EHeb., OAram., OffAram., Palm., JAram., Nab. *ptḡ* id. (NWSI II, 948-949), CA *fataḡa* id., Eth. *ftḡ* id.

The Egyp. cognate is *ptḡ* "to open" also "to make open-work, engrave" (EHD I, 258) = Phoen. *ptḡ* "chisel work, carved work", OffAram. *ptḡ* "carved" (NWSI II, 950-951). The same root also expresses in Egyp. "to beg, to ask, to pray" = CA *fataḡa* "to judge"; CIII *fātaḡa* "to prosecute" also "to engage in argument", Sab. *h-ftḡ* "to obtain a judicial order"; *ftḡ* "judicial order, lawsuit" (SD, 47): see §2.8.18, n. 4 below.

**2.1.6.11** One *marked characteristic* of Bin Faris' dictionary is that it adopts a semantic approach to explicate the significations of roots, i.e. *a trilateral root may be a complex of a number of roots sharing in common the same radicals though differing from one*

another in origin and signification. The opposite and prevalent approach used in all other CA dictionaries, however, considers words sharing in common *the same radical consonants in the same order* as being derivatives of the same root.

A third interesting and suggestive theory on how roots should be classified phonologically and semantically is advanced by Ibin Jinni: *words sharing in common the same radical consonants could be derivatives of the same root regardless the order of their radical consonants* (for a detailed study of this *revolutionary* approach, see §2.2.51, under *Comments* below).

Some illustrative examples from Bin Faris' work are:

1) [s'f] expresses two unrelated root meanings: (a) "(palm-)branch (coll.)" = BHeb. s'p pl. "branch; cut off branches" (OT, 729; Ryder, 1974: 126)), and (b) "to aid" (ML III, 73).

2) On the etymology of [ʾġl], Bin Faris (ML I, 64-65) says: «*Know that /ʾ/, /ġ/, and /l/ give rise to five unrelated words... each is a root by itself*». Some of such root meanings are: (a) "delaying, putting off"<sup>33</sup>, (b) "yes"<sup>34</sup>, (c) "flock of wild cows"<sup>35</sup>, (d) "large basin, reservoir"<sup>36</sup>.

3) [ġfr] expresses two root meanings: (a) an adjective describing something 'hollowed' and (b) 'abandoning something' (ML I, 466).

To my understanding, final /-r/ is definitely a suffix, and the triliteral has developed from ʾa-ġwafu ~ mu-ġauwafu "hollow(ed)"; ġawifa "be hollowed" and ġafā "to turn from, shun, to estrange".

4) [hwr] expresses one meaning, said of anything, "falling in succession (= *tasāḳuṭu* id., a noun derived from CVI stem)" (ML VI, 18). For its etymology, see n. 6 below.

5) [hdm] expresses one meaning "leveling to the ground a structure or building" (ML VI, 41). To my understanding, the triliteral is a compound of at least three proots: \*hw- "to fall down, to ruin", \*-d-, and \*-m-.

Stem \*haw- is seen in BHeb. hāwā "to fall, to ruin", CA hawā "to fall down, to fall" (OT, 247), Egyp. h' "to fall down, to go to waste and ruin, be destroyed" ~ hw "to fall (down), descend", Copt. hey (EHD I, 439, 444), Syr. hewā "tomber", SA: Meh., Hars. hewō, Jib. hē id., Berb. To. ihi, iha "tomber dans", etc. (DRS V, 385), Chad. Buduma hai "to descend", Cush.: Iraqw, Alagwa, Burungo hu- "to fall" (HSED, n. 1163).

In SL and other Arabic dialects (see DRS V, 383-384) *hauwad*, i.e. *of two stems*: haw- + -d, "to descend, to go down(ward)" → hadd "make s.t. (*wall*, etc. *any structure*) fall down, demolish, pull down": CA hadda "to demolish, dilapidate, pull down (e.g. *a wall*)", Egyp. hd "to trample down, to vanquish, to strike, suppress"; hdhd "to batter

<sup>33</sup> Consider ʾarġaʾa "to put off, postpone" (= ʾaġġala id.); ʾirġā "putting off, postponement, delaying" = ta-ʾġīl.

<sup>34</sup> Consider ġairi = ʾaġal = "yes" (LA).

<sup>35</sup> In LA ʾiġlu "a flock of wild cows and deer". The word is either a variant of ʾiġlu "calf" (gen Sem. ʾġl id.) or from ʾiyyalu "stag" (gen. Sem. ʾyl id.). As a matter of fact, the interchange of /y/ and /ġ/ has given rise to ʾiġġalu "stag". This type of interchange will be studied in §2.6.13 below.

<sup>36</sup> BHeb., Sab. ʾgl "tank, cistern" (§2.3.37, n. 2 below).

down, to beat small, to crush” (EHD I, 452) < h’d “to pull down a boundary stone or wall, to attack” (EHD I, 443); Hdd “a god” (EHD I, 452) = *Hadad*, an idol of the Syrians and of the Edomites (OT, 243), etc.

The trilateral [hdm] expresses *a stronger meaning* than [had], i.e. *everything of a structure is pulled down to ground*: CA hadama “to demolish, to knock down”, SA: Meh., Hars., Jib. hdm “to destroy, ruin”, Ge. hadama, Te. hadāmā “to escape”; Te. haddāmā “to destroy, ruin”, etc., Cush.: Bed. hadim id. (DRS V, 376-378), Egyp. hdm “to shatter, to break” (EHD I, 452). It is most amazing to find *a strange stem* like *dahdama* in CA = hadama above.

6) By suffixing \*-r to [hw], we get a trilateral [hwr] (see n. 4 above) as in CA hāra “to destroy, demolish, pull down”, CV tahauwara ~ tahaiyara [hwr ~ hyr], said of any structure, “be destroyed, pulled down, fall down, collapse”, SA: Had. yhr “être en ruine”, Meh. hōyer “précipice” (= CA mihwār id.), etc. (DRS V, 390). SL harhar “to fall apart”, said of something *was once tenacious*, like a wall, etc.

It is of great importance to draw attention to the following fact: SL *hauwar*, said of a driver, “to drive off the road and fall into *hāwiya-h* or abyss”, said of anything/person, “to fall headlong, imperil” (= CA hauwara id.). The causative form of [hwr] seems to be SL *dahwar* = *make* + *hwr*: CA *dahwara*, said of a wall, “make it fall down by pushing it”, i.e. *cause it to fall, make it fall*; *dahwara-tu* “gathering or holding a thing and throw it headlong into an abyss” and is classified by all old Arab scholars and Semitists as being from a trilateral [dhr]. Here belongs Sab. dhr “to burn or destroy (a town, city)” (SD, 35). For an etymologically different [dhr], see §2.5.12 below.

7) [‘wr] = (a) “*circulation*” (of a thing from one to another in a continuous way)” as in CIV n. ta’āwuru, and (b) “*blind of one eye*” (ML IV, 184). We have here two etymologically different compounds, both are discussed in §2.17.2 below, along with their HS cognates.

8) [‘rf] = (a) “*an interrupted succession*” and (b) “*familiarity, i.e. feel comfortable being with, have confidence in*” (ML IV, 280), hence “*to know, be acquainted with, recognize*”.

9) [rb’], Bin Faris says: /r/, /b/, and /’/ express three root meanings: (1) ‘*quarter*’, i. e. *rub’u* (gen. Sem. rb’ id.), (2) “*dwelling, residing*” (= Sab. rb’ “residence” also “townsfolk” (SD, 113) = CA rab’u “clan, one’s relatives”, etc., and (3) “*lifting up, raising ~ rising*” (ML II, 479) also “*to lift up and carry*” = Ug. rb’ “to bring” (UG, 531). Each meaning derives into words expressing different shades of the same meaning. It is to be noted that the most widely used term expressing “to lift up, raise” throughout the history of the language is *rafa’a*, with voiceless /p/.

### 2.1.7 SEMITIC ROOT STRUCTURE

Before beginning our deep study of HS root structure, it may be well to present a sketchy account of Semitic roots, along with an analysis and scientific evaluation of the traditional assumptions built on these roots and the method used to classify them. Let us consider what a traditional work says about them.

1) In Semitic languages, a word typically has a stem consisting of two parts: *the root*,

which is generally a framework of three consonants and carries the basic meaning of the word, and *the pattern*, which consists of vowels (or vowels and consonants) and provides variations in the basic meaning or serves as an inflection. For example, the CA word *kātibu* consists of a root /ktb/ which has to do with *writing*, and pattern /-ā- -i-/ that implies “one who writes”, i.e. *writer*.

1a) Roots are classified in two ways: first according to *the number of radical consonants*, and, second, according to *the kind or nature of radical consonants*. According to the first criterion, the overwhelming majority of roots consist of three radical consonants. There are some biliteral and quadrilateral roots, but roots with one or with five radicals are rare.

1b) In terms of the kind of radical consonants, Semitic roots are divided into two major classes, *the strong* and *the weak* (or ‘*defective*’), with each class having a number of subclasses. A strong root does not have the unstable /w/ or /y/ as one of its radicals. A weak root, on the other hand, may have, at least, one semivowel as one of its radicals. For example, Semitic [ʔty] “to come”, [twʔ] “to eat”, [wɗʔ] “to put”, and [ħyy] “to live” are all weak triliters. The semivowels /w/ and /y/ are unstable; they may interchange position with each other or with the glottal stop /ʔ/, become vowels, or disappear. The two semivowels and /ʔ/ are called by Arab grammarians *ḥurūf (ʔa)l līn*, *the soft letters*, or *ḥurūf (ʔa)l ʔillah*, *the weak letters*.

Consider, for example, the instability of /w/ in the following derivatives of root [kwm] “to rise”:

- w > \*ā: as in CA *qāma*, BHeb. *qōm*, Eth. *qōma*, Syr. *qām* “he rose”,
- w > \*u: as in CA *qumta*, BHeb. *qamta* “you (masc. sg.) rose”,
- w > \*ū: as in CA *qum*, dial. *qūm*, BHeb., Eth., Aram. *qūm* imper. “rise!”,  
CA *yaqūmu* “he rises”, BHeb. *yāqūm*, Eth. *yeqūm* id.,
- w > \*ʔ: as in CA *qāʔimu*, BHeb. *qām*, Aram. *qāʔem* “one who rises”,
- w > \*au: as in CA *qāumu*, BHeb. *qōm*, Eth. *qawīm* “rising”,
- w > \*y: as in CA *qiyāmu* “standing, rising”, *qiyāmatu* “(day of) Judgment”, Mand. *qaiamta* “rising up”.

2) The statement made above about the *instability* of /w/ will be misleading without some clarification since it may give the impression that the change is sporadic. In fact, the change of /-w-/ into any other sound is regular and systematic, e.g. for any verb with medial semivowel /-w-/ the 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. masc. sg. preterit has the stem {CāCa, C = a consonant} in CA, hence *dāma* “continue”, *ʔāda* “returned”, *qāla* “said”, *dāra* “revolved, turned round”, and so forth; the 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. masc. sg. preterit has the stem {CuCta} as in *dumta*, *ʔudta*, *qulta*, and *durta* respectively, their respective imperative forms are *dum!*, *ʔud!*, *qul!*, *dur!*. It can thus be said that the change is regular and the same changes noted in the stems of [kwm] recur in the corresponding stems of all other hollow-roots.

3) For what concerns Hamitic roots, esp. Egyp, Gardiner (EG, §§277-287) employs the same criteria outlined above and classifies the roots according to *the number and nature of radical consonants*, whether they are of two, three, four, or five consonants, and whether they are *weak*, *strong*, or *doubled*.

### 2.1.7.1 Subclasses of Semitic Strong Roots

The strong roots are classified as *sound*, *doubled*, or *hamzated*. A *sound* root consists of any three different consonants other than /ʔ/ as in [gʒr] “to cut”, [dmd] “to bind”, [ʔbd] “to serve”, [hbʔ] “to strike”. The *doubled* (sometimes called ‘*geminate*’ or ‘*solid*’) root is one in which the second and third consonants are identical as in [drr] “to harm”, [ʔzz] “be strong”, [mdd] “to measure”, and [pll] “to separate”. The *hamzated* root has the glottal stop /ʔ/ (or ‘*hamzah*’) as one of its radical consonants. One important characteristic of the *hamzated* root is the loss of postvocalic /ʔ/ in some languages, with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel, e.g.

Semitic \**raʔšu* “head” is in CA *raʔsu*, but in Akk. *rēšu*, BHeb. *rōš*, Syr. *rēšā*.

Semitic \**yaʔħuðu* “will take” is in CA *yaʔħuðu*, but in Akk. *ʾēhuz*, BHeb. *yōħez*, Eth. *yaʾahaz*.

Semitic \**malaʾa* “be full, fill” is in CA *malaʾa*, but in Akk. *malū*, BHeb. *mālē*, Syr. *mālā*, etc. (cf. Gray, 1971: §§414, 415, Moscati, 1969:§16.112f).

### 2.1.7.2 Subclasses of Weak Roots

The weak roots may be classified into three major subclasses, depending on the position occupied by /w/ or /y/ in the root: (a) *first consonant weak* as in [ybš] “be dry” and [wdʔ] “to know”; (b) *middle consonant weak* (or hollow root) as in [tyb] “be good” and [γwθ] “to help”; and (c) *last consonant weak* as in [kny] “to acquire” and [bny] “to construct”. In addition, one may find cases where two consonants are weak as in [ħyy] “to live” and [kwy] “be strong”, [wķy] “to guard, protect”, etc.

1) In some Semitic languages like Heb. and Phoen., roots with identical second and third radicals, and with an initial /n-/ or laryngeal are also weak (Moscati, 1969:§16.109-16.111, 16.116, Gray, 1971: 114ff).

2) The combination of root and vowels gives rise to the so-called ‘*the basic* (or *ground*) stem. For verbs, the basic stem may have the pattern CaCaC-, CaCiC-, or CaCuC- (C = *any consonant*). The pattern CaCaC- is *active* and expresses an action as in CA *kataba*, BHeb. *katab* “to write”. Its *passive* counterpart has the pattern CuCiC- as in CA *ʔukila*, BHeb. *ʔukkal* “be eaten”; CA *ṭurida*, Aram. *ṭerīd* “be driven”. The two other patterns express a state or condition: CaCiC- as in CA *yabisa*, BHeb. *yābēš*, Eth. *yabesa* “be dry” and CaCuC- as in Akk. *maruṣ*, CA *maruḏa* “be sick”; Syr. *šākōl*, CA *ṭakula* “be bereaved”; BHeb. *ḵaṭon*, CA *ḵaṭuna* “be small”.

3) Unlike the verb stems, noun stems have a great variety of stems such as CaCaC- as in *gamalu* “camel”, CaCiC- as in *kabidu* “liver”, CuCuC- as in *bukuru* “first born”, CaCC- as in *baʔlu* “lord”, CiCC- as in *ʔiglu* “calf”, CuCC- as in *ʔuḏnu* “ear”, etc.

### 2.1.7.3 Derived Stems

Besides the basic stems there are derived or complex stems, which contain, in addition to vowels, one or more consonantal affixes, and express various modifications of the root meaning. For example, from the three radical consonants [fʕl] “do”, it is theoretically possible to derive as many as fifteen classes of verbs and substances (nouns and adjectives) in a language like CA, and the traditional work indicates the semantic value of each stem by terms like ‘*intensive*’, ‘*causative*’, ‘*conative*’, ‘*reflexive*’,



‘reciprocal’, and so forth. By symbolizing the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> radical consonants of the root by the letters /F/, /ǧ/, and /L/ respectively, the entire system looks as follows<sup>37</sup>

I	FaǧaLa	VI	taFāǧaLa	XI.	’iFǧāLLa
II	FaǧǧaLa	VII	’inFaǧaLa	XII	’iFǧawǧaLa
III	FāǧaLa	VIII	’iFtaǧaLa	XIII	’iFǧawwaLa
IV	’aFǧaLa	IX	’iFǧaLLa	XIV	’iFǧanLaLa
V	taFaǧǧaLa	X.	’istaFǧaLa	XV	’iFǧanLā

Before illustrating these derived stems, *three facts* should be kept in mind:

a) CA has more stems than the above-mentioned by Old Arab grammarians and Semitists. Such stems have rarely been used in the language and are identified in this research as ‘*strange stems*’, e.g. §2.1.6.11, n. 5 and §2.3.32 below.

b) There are variations in the formation of the derived stems in Semitic languages, for a comprehensive view, see references cited below.

c) A deep understanding of those CA stems can make possible a scientific study of Hamito-Semitic roots. Otherwise, any study will be a waste of time, ink, and paper. The reason for this strong claim will become obvious from §2.2 onward below; *it is one of the affixes above or its equivalent in other Hamito-Semitic languages that constitutes the third radical of the majority of Hamito-Semitic trilaterals*. At least, the *first ten* of such stems are Proto-Semitic. This statement is a direct contradiction of all Semitists’ assertion on Semitic stems who consider *only some of the first ten* as Proto-Semitic. It will also be shown in the course of this research that most of them *are also present in Old Egyptian*. This is also a direct contradiction of Egyptologists’ view. As we have seen so far and will see from §2.2 onward, neither Semitists nor Egyptologists have proved a professional skill and deep insights in their studies of Semitic or Egyptian languages that qualify them to detect simple and obvious facts like, for instance, the obvious presence of CVIII in Egyptian, or to write ‘*only one single meaningful sentence*’ on the real structure of either Semitic or Egyptian.

1) CI is the ground or basic stem. As pointed out above (§2.1.7.2, n. 2), CI has three stems depending on whether the vowel of the 2<sup>nd</sup> syllable is /a/, /i/, or /u/, and the passive voice is formed by ablaut and has a stem *FuǧiLa* as in *kataba* “write” > *kutiba* (§2.1.7.2, n. 2 above).

2) The *intensive* (CII above) is formed from the basic or ground-stem by doubling the second radical consonant (FaǧaL- > FaǧǧaL-) as in CA *kassara* against *kasara* “to break”, Akk. *ukabbis* against *ikbus* “to tread”. This pattern may also have a *causative aspect* as in Akk. *unammir* against *innir* (\**innir*) “to shine” and CA *ḍaḥḥaka* against *ḍaḥjika* “to laugh”.

The agent noun is formed from this stem by doubling the 2<sup>nd</sup> radical and lengthening the following vowel as in CA *ǧazzāru* “butcher”, *ṭaḥḥānu* “miller”, Akk. *gallābu*, “barber”, *ḥabbātu* “robber”. On the other hand, the agent noun of CI stems is formed by lengthening the vowel of the 1<sup>st</sup> syllable as in *kataba* “to write” > *kātibu* “writer”, ‘*alima* “to know” > ‘*ālīmu* “one who knows; knower”.

<sup>37</sup> Following Semitists’ practice, the form of the verb we use as paradigm is always the 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. masc. sg. perfect. It is always rendered into English by the infinitive as *kataba* “to write”, instead of “he wrote” or “he has written”.

A natural question may be asked: *what is the difference in meaning between agent nouns of CI and CII?* The semantic difference lies in the difference in meaning between their stems, hence *'alima* simply means “to know” and *'ālimu* “one who knows, knower”, whereas *'allama* “to teach, make one know” > *'allāmu* “one who knows exceedingly”, *kattābu* “one who writes to excess”, and so forth.

3) The *conative* (CIII) is formed by changing the vowel /a/ of the 1<sup>st</sup> syllable into /ā/ (FaḡaL- > FāḡaL-) as in CA *kātaba* “to correspond” against *kataba* “to write”, *bāraka*, Eth. *bāraka* “to bless”, etc.

4) The *causative* (CIV) is formed by prefixing ' (especially in CA and Eth.) as in CA *'anzala* “make one descend” against *nazala* “to descend”. The corresponding causative prefix in other Semitic languages is either /-š/, (especially in Akk. and Ug.) and /h-/ (especially in BHeb., Sab., and pre-CA.), as in Akk. *uṣabri* against *ibri* “to see”, Sab. *hšb'* against *šb'* “to surrender”. It will be shown that caus. /'-/ is found in the entire Hamito-Semitic languages (see §2.3 below). The same statement applies to /š-/ (§2.2 below), where all Hamito-Semitic languages, including Egyp, Akk., etc., have also adopted it in some of its occurrences as an inseparable part of the root.

5) The *reflexive* (Class V) is formed from Class II by prefixing /t-/ (FaḡḡaL- > taFaḡḡaL-) as in CA *taḡamma'a* against *ḡamma'a* “to assemble”, Akk. *uktammis* (from \*utkammis by metathesis) “be bowed down”, Syr. *'eṭḥaššan* “be fortified” (= CA *taḥšaššana* id.), Amh. *tānaffäsä* “to breathe” (= CA *tanaffasa* id.), etc. see §2.7 below.

6) The *reciprocal* (CVI) is formed from CIII verbs by prefixing /t-/ as in CA *tamāḥala*, Eth. *tamāsala* “to resemble each other”, Sab. *t'šr* “to struggle with one another”. This class of verbs, like the others, is found in all Hamito-Semitic languages, but with t- being part of the root (see §2.7 below).

7) The *passive* (CVII) is formed from CI by prefixing 'in- (FaḡaL- > 'inFaḡaL-) as in Akk. *ippalti* (\*inpalti) “be defeated”, CA *'insatara* “be hidden” against *satara* “to hide” = BHeb. *nistar* “be concealed”. It is also found as part of the root in all Hamito-Semitic language divisions (§2.11).

8) The *middle voice* (CVIII) is formed by infixing -t- between the first and second radical consonants of the ground-stem (FaḡaL- > -FtaḡaL-) as in CA *'imtala'a* against *mala'a* “to fill”, Akk. *imtalī* against *malū* “to fill”, and Ug. *yrthš* “he washes himself” (= CA *yartaḥīdu* id.), Sab. *rtḏḥ* “engage in pitched battle” [r. rḏḥ]. The infix is also found in all Hamito-Semitic languages (see §3.8 below).

9) CIX is formed from the ground stem by doubling the third radical (FaḡuL- > FḡaLL-), as in CA *'iḥmarra* “become red”, Akk. *utnennu* “to pray”, Syr. *'abded* “be enslaved”.

10) The *causative reflexive* (CX) is made from CI by prefixing st-: a combination of causative /š-/ and reflexive /t-/ as in CA *'istama'a* “to listen” (*sami'a* “to hear”), Akk. *šutēšuru* “to lead, direct” (*ēšēru* “be straight”), Sab. *stwfy* “to accomplish” (*wfy* “fulfill an obligation” = CA *'istawfaya*), Min. *štwwθk* “to guarantee” (*wθk* “to trust” = CA *'istawθaka* “make certain”), Eth. *'estanfisa* “to draw a breath” (*nfs* “breathe”). In contrast to old Arab scholars and Semitists' view, I believe that CX is based on CIV and not on CI or ground stem (see §2.22, n. 5a below). The passive has a stem *'istuFiḡLa* as in *'istu'mila* “be used”.

The last five stems are of rare occurrence and it may be sufficient to give examples on two of them to illustrate both the mode of formation and the meaning.

11) CXI expresses an *ephemeral state or condition* as opposed to a *permanent state or condition expressed by CIX* (see §2.19.2 below).

12) CXII (the only one of this subgroup in use in SL) as in CA 'iḥdawdaba “become humpbacked”, is from ḥadiba id. To Ibin Jinni (Khaṣā'iṣ II, 156) CXII verbs express ‘*exaggeration or intensiveness*’ just like such reduplicative forms as *damakmaka*, ‘*arakraka*, etc. In this view, Ibin Jinni reiterates what Sibawayhi had earlier prescribed. This is evidently a wrong view and stems 'iḤawḥaLa and FaḥaLaLa (e.g. *damakmaka*) express different meanings.

CXII expresses the *highest point, degree, level, and the like + meaning of the verb*, e.g. ḥalā “be sweet”; CXII 'iḥlawlā “reach the highest degree of sweetness”, ḳalā “to rise”; CXII 'iḳlawlā “to go up the highest point (of a mountain)”, 'iḳlawdana, said of plants, grass, “reach the highest degree of greenness”, etc. (see Siyuti, Muzhir I, 332)<sup>38</sup>.

### 2.1.8 Weaknesses of the Traditional Approach

There is no denying that the traditional method has yielded a highly descriptive work in which the root structure and its derivational and inflectional morphology are set out in great detail and accuracy. However, valuable as the work obviously is, the traditional method is deficient in that it deals *only* with the surface structures of roots and leaves their deep structures untouched.

It is indubitably evident that the surface structure of Semitic [gʒr] “to cut”, for example, contains exactly, as the traditional work claims, three radical consonants in number; yet its underlying structure may not contain that number, nor is it supposed to be phonologically<sup>39</sup> identical with the surface form. Before entering into an investigation of this fact, it may be well to make a fundamental distinction between surface and deep structure.

#### 2.1.8.1 Surface and Deep Structure of a Triliteral Root

A surface structure is the ‘*outer form*’ of a root and can be easily arrived at by subtraction; *the radical consonants of a word which remain after vowels and affixes are removed are called a root*. Removing these from CA *maḡzaratun* “massacre”, for example, leaves the surface root [ḡʒr] “to slaughter, cut up”. A deep structure, on the other hand, is the ‘*inner form*’ of a root and contains, as we will see, no more than two radical consonants. For *true information* on this deep structure, see n. c below.

There is another marked difference between *surface* and *deep* structures. The former expresses a *specific or special meaning*, while the latter expresses an *abstract or general meaning*. The problem with this deep structure in a large number of Semitic trilaterals,

---

<sup>38</sup> For CA first ten stems and other derived stems in various Semitic languages, see W. Wright 1966: Chap. VIII, Gray 1971: Chap. VIII, Moscati 1969: 122-129, O’Leary 1969: Chap. XI, Murtonen 1967: 31-58.

<sup>39</sup> It will be shown that radical /z/ is from an earlier /ḡ/ (§2.17.51, under *Comments* below).

however, is that it is inaccessible to direct empirical study of roots taken separately or one root at a time, but rather to groups of kindred roots, i.e. *those having two radicals in common- usually the first two, but certainly not always*.

In order to discover and describe ‘*the deep fact*’ that lies beneath certain groups of Semitic surface trilaterals, we must therefore work *backward* from the *accessible group of trilaterals* to the *inaccessible single biliteral* that underlies them (for further detail on this point, see §2.1.9.4 below). Let us apply this method to all roots having in common with [gʒr] “to cut” the first two radicals /gz-/, and see how far the use of kindred trilaterals can go in the discovery of deep structure.

1. [gʒr]: in OAram. “to cut up”, BAram. “to break off”, OffAram., Mand. “to cut (off)”, Syr. “to cut away”, BHeb. “to cut, cut in two, divide”, CA “to cut up, slaughter”; Ge., Amh., Tna., Te. “to circumcise”;

2. [gʒz]: in Akk. “to shear, clip”, Ug. “to shear, cut”, Aram., Mand., OffAram., Pal., BHeb. “to shear, cut”, CA “to shear”, OSA “to decide, decree”;

3. [gʒl]: in Phoen. “to tear (out)”, BHeb. “to tear away, strip off, as skin from the flesh, pluck off or away”, Mand., Syr., Jp. “to tear away, cut”, CA “to cut in two, incise; half”;

4. [gʒm]: in CA “to cut from the end”, Aram., Eth. “to cut”, Mand. “to cut off, threaten”, Syr. “to cut off, determine; decree”, BHeb. “to cut off”, Sab. “to extirpate”;

5. [gʒy]: in Aram., Talm., Jp. “to cut off; fleece”, CA, OffAram. “fleece”, Pun. “to cut, carve”, BHeb. “to cut (off)”;

6. [gʒḥ]: in CA “to cut away, cut back; small part”, Soq. “part”;

8. [gʒʾ]: in CA “to cut or divide into parts”, Sab. “part of *wadi* (valley) cut off above ~ below dam”, corresponding to CA ḡizʾu “fertile part of *wadi* wide enough for trees and plants to grow”. As a verb “to cross (i.e. to cut) a valley widthwise” as in the PIP of Imri Al Qais:

«... wa ’āharu minhum ḡāziʾun naḡda kaukabi» (LA).

9. [gʒb]: in CA ḡizbu “part, share (of money)” also, like ḡizmu above, expresses “share (of anything)”.

10. [gʒʾ]: in CA “to cut in half or in two”; SA “to cut”, BHeb. “to cut off”, Aram., Syr. “be cut”, Eth. “to saw”.

It is sufficient to observe that the above cited nine traditional trilaterals, different though they are in the final (or third) radical, express one single idea ‘*to cut*’. It follows, then, that there must naturally be a single underlying phonological structure to represent such a general idea. Let us assume tentatively that the general idea “to cut” is expressed by the underlying biliteral \*gz-, and that the final radical suffixed to \*gz- is ‘*a root-determinative*’, defined tentatively as *a radical serving to derive a trilateral from a biliteral stem*.

Before elaborating on this interesting linguistic phenomenon in an attempt to explore and explain all its aspects, the fact should be recognized that my discussion of the phenomenon will serve *two purposes*:

a) *To pave the way to a much more important topic entitled: ‘abstract versus special meaning’* in section §2.1.10 below. Accordingly, the discussion below is a means to an end, and not an end by itself. It will be used to explore and explain thoroughly the *just*

*mentioned topic as well as the development of Hamito-Semitic root.*

b) Semitists have long considered this phenomenon as strong evidence supporting their '*biliteral theory*', but without troubling themselves to explain it and demonstrate how it serves to prove the correctness of the theory. From here, my treatment of the phenomenon will have three additional aims:

(i) *To explain it as clearly as I can, exactly as I do with any modern theory before taking a decision on its validity.*

(ii) *To show that it is not confined to Semitic division, but rather common to other HS language divisions.*

(iii) *To leave the final judgment whether it supports the biliteral theory to the reader to decide upon as he proceeds in reading a few additional pages of this research.*

It will also be left to the reader's discretion to judge whether the *deep structure*, as defined above, is not in effect what we may call '*a second surface form*' or '*older surface structure*'.

### **2.1.9 Decisive Arguments for an Underlying Biliteral Structure**

Two decisive arguments supported by concrete evidence will be brought forward to disprove the traditional trilateral classification of Semitic roots. The arguments will also attempt to explain the relation between a surface trilateral and its underlying biliteral form.

#### **2.1.9.1 Argument I**

The group of trilaterals just set forth above shows clearly that the addition of a root-determinative to the biliteral \*gz- serves to express only one specific shade of '*cutting*'. Hence, *the more phonetically different root-determinatives we have, the more shades of meaning we obtain.* Reconsider the shades of meanings expressed by these CA trilaterals:

gʒr "to cut up"  
gzz "to cut the hair or fleece"  
gzl "to cut in two"  
gzm "to cut from the end"  
gz' "to cut in half"  
gz' "to cut into parts", etc.

Another striking fact revealed from the group of kindred trilaterals is that one, without previous knowledge of its general meaning, can predict the idea conveyed by any of its members, if he gains access to the basic meaning of *only one of them*. Thus, knowledge of the general idea expressed by [gʒr], for instance, can give guiding information as to the idea expressed by any of its kindred roots.

Our ability to predict the general meaning expressed by a Semitic trilateral root from the meaning of *one of its kindred trilaterals* applies not only to the group of trilaterals discussed above, but also to many others. Accordingly, we may state, as a general rule,

that knowledge of the general idea expressed by {XZ-D}<sup>40</sup> can make possible a true prediction that this same general idea will also be expressed by its kindred trilaterals /XZ-b/, XZ-m/, XZ-r/, XZ-y/, etc. Some examples will make this statement perfectly clear.

1) The Semitic trilateral [ply] (in BHeb. “be distinct, separated”, Eth., Syr., Mand. “to separate”, and in CA “to wean”) seems to express a general idea “to separate”. Now, if the rule is true, then, its kindred roots must also express this same general idea. Let us see and judge.

[plk]: in Assy. “to split”, CA “to split open, distinguish”, Phoen. “province”, Amh., Har., Tna. “to split”, Te. “division”;

[plg]: in Phoen. “to divide”, CA “be distinct, to cut; part”, OAram., BAram., Palm., Mand. “to divide; part, half”, BHeb. “to divide; half, part”;

[pl’]: in BHeb. “to distinguish, separate”, CA “to make clear, split”;

[pll]: in Assy. “to judge, arbitrate”, CA “to severe, break”, BHeb. “to discern, judge”, Eth. “to pull apart”;

[plt]: in Phoen., BHeb., Aram., Syr., Mand., CA “be separated, to escape”, ESA “to save”, Ge. “to separate”, Har. “to split wood with an axe”, Tna. “to split wood”, Amh., Arg. “to split”;

[plh]: in BHeb. “to cleave”, CA “to plow”, Syr. “to cleave”. In addition, plt, plδ, ply etc. express in CA different shades of the idea ‘to separate’.

It should be remembered that meanings like “split”, “divide”, “distinguish”, “cut”, etc. are synonymous. Any of which may replace ‘separate’ in this sentence: *The fence separates the two farms*, with a slightly different shade of meaning. Thus, it becomes apparent from these trilaterals that the rule is applicable since all of them have to do with the same general idea expressed by their kindred [ply]. Based on this fact, we may, therefore, confidently state that the substitution of one root-determinative (or third radical) for another in the same linguistic environment does not change the general idea denoted by the underlying biliteral {XZ-}. Indeed no matter whether -k, -t, -’, or any other radical is suffixed to [pl-], the general idea ‘to separate’ is unchanged. This fact proves that the third radical is not part of the phonological elements contained in the deep structure and expressing the idea of ‘cutting’.

### 2.1.9.2 Argument II

We may present another argument in favor of a deep biliteral root. We have just noted that root-determinatives can interchange position with one another without affecting the basic idea denoted by the underlying {XZ-}. This phenomenon does not hold true for root-formatives, i.e. {XZ-}. In fact, any modification of the underlying form {XZ-} is correlated with a complete change of meaning. This is an additional proof that the root-determinative is not part of the deep phonological structure that lies beneath it.

<sup>40</sup> The symbols /X/, /Z/, and /-D/ represent the first, second, and third radicals of a trilateral root respectively. Of these radicals, /X/ and /Z/ are the two constituents of the underlying biliteral (or root-formatives) and /-D/ represents a root determinative.

1) The substitution of a radical for any of the two constituents of biliteral \*gz- “to cut” above, for instance, would alter its underlying semantic content. For example, the substitution of a radical, say /-b/, for /z/ in the underlying biliteral \*gz- causes a complete change of meaning. The new underlying biliteral \*gb- has to do with “to raise, heap, be high or great” as the following examples may suggest:

[gbn]: in CA, Aram. “forehead”, BHeb. “eye-brow, brow”, Mand. “summit”;

[gbh]: in CA “front, forehead”, Aram. “be high”, BHeb. “be high, to rise”, Te. “front”;

[gbh]: in Akk. “bald”, BHeb., Syr. “bald at the front of the head”, CA “be haughty, proud”;

[gbl]: in CA “mountain”, BHeb., OAram. “end, boundary”, Phoen. “limit, boundary”, SA “mountainous region”;

[gbr]: in CA “giant”; BHeb. “hero”, Akk. “force”, OAram., Phoen., Syr. gabrā “man”;

[gbʿ]: in Akk. “summit”, Ug. “hill, summit”, CA, BHeb. “hillside, mound”, Aram. “hunch-backed”, Amh. “hill”;

[gbb]: in BHeb. “top, back”; CA “to swell; huge, tip of the horn”, Jp. “summit”, Syr. “hunch-backed”;

[gbθ]: in Ug. “hump”, BHeb., Jp. “to heap”;

[gbʾ]: in CA “hill”; etc.

### 2.1.9.3 Further Remarks on the Weaknesses of the Traditional Work

Turning now to the traditional work on Semitic roots, we find that the work does not distinguish between deep and surface structures. It classifies a form like [gʒr], for example, as an autonomous trilateral on the erroneous assumption that its underlying form must be identical with the surface one. In so doing, it fails to notice the obvious semantic relation that links [gʒr] to other trilaterals sharing with it the first two radicals /gz-/ like [gʒl], [gʒm], [gʒy], etc. above. Accordingly, the traditional classification of Semitic roots, though may be *valid as an account of surface structure*, is certainly *invalid as an account of deep structure* since it fails to yield the classification that we must presuppose to account for the semantic concurrence of the groups of trilaterals cited thus far in the first two of their radicals.

**2.1.9.4** One important fact has been mentioned in §2.1.8.1 above to which it is necessary to call special attention and add details. This is concerned with the discovery of deep structures of groups of kindred roots. As mentioned earlier, in order to gain insights into the true nature of deep structures that underlies *some Semitic groups* of trilaterals, one must examine closely the group of roots with which the trilateral shares in common the two radicals, and not the trilateral itself, which is incapable of unveiling true information on its deep structure. To see why this is so, notice that an individual trilateral like [prs] “to divide”, for example, when set apart from the corpus and studied, does not provide evidence that calls to question the traditional information. It is indeed impossible to tell with certainty that one of its radicals is a root-determinative. But when we examine the relation of /prs/ to other trilaterals having in common with it the first two radicals \*pr-,

we soon discover that the abstract notion ‘to divide’ is actually expressed by \*pr-, and that the third radical /-s/ is a surface element added to \*pr- to express a shade of its meaning, i.e. a *special meaning*. Accordingly, the substitution of any radical for /-s/ cannot change the basic idea of \*pr-.

Another very important fact to which attention should be drawn is that the tendency to adopt a radical as an integral part of the root is not limited to Semitic, but is also seen in all Hamitic language divisions as the following examples will demonstrate:

[pr̥r]: in Akk., Assy. “to break in pieces”, Ug. “to break”, CA “to split up”, BHeb. “to break in pieces, divide, split”; p̥rūr-īm pl. “crumbs”, Ge. fərfar “crumbs of bread”, Har. firāfāra “crumble into small pieces”, Amh. fārāffārā “crumble”, Te. fārāfāra “be reduced to powder”, Tna. fərfar “small pieces of wood”: Berb.: Snus frurī “to thresh”, Semlal fruri id., Kabyl fri “to tear”, Chad.: Daba pur “to tear”, Tangale pure “to break into pieces”, Mafa p̥ar- “to cut”;

[pr̥s]: in Akk. “to divide”, Assy. “to divide; decide”, BHeb. “to divide, split”, BAram. “to divide”, Phoen. “part”, OAram. “half”, CA, OSA “to break”: Chad.: Mofu pirs- “to grind”, Makilko pirza “crush (grain)”;

[pr̥t̥]: in Akk. “to pluck (fruit)”, BHeb. “to break off”, Eth. “to separate”, CA “to detach”, Syr. “to cull fruit”, Mand. “to break apart, separate”, Pun. “to divide”, Amh., Arg. “to break, separate, burst”, Har. “to burst”: Chad.: Kera perte “to break, crack”, Buduma firte “to tear”, Ngizim p̥ert- “take apart, untie”;

[pr̥š]: in Akk., Aram., Nab. “to divide, separate”, Mand. “to separate, set apart”, CA “broken pieces of bone”, Sab. “boundary wall of field”: Egyp. pr̥š “to stretch out” (= CA faraša, CVIII ’iftaraša id.), Chad.: Mafa purš- “to tear off”, Sokoro purse “to split”, Berb.: Semlal fərs “to separate, cut”, Ahggar, Tawlemmet əfrəs “to cut”;

[pr̥ʃ]: in Akk. “to break”, BHeb. “to destroy, break”, Aram. pr̥ʃ “to break through”, CA “to cleave, split”, etc. All are most likely from [pr̥d] below;

[pr̥d̥]: Phoen. “to break through”, Ug. “to open”, CA “to incise, notch, make a breach”, BHeb. “to break, make a breach”, Aram., Mand. “to break through, to make a breach”, Sab. “opening in dam wall” = CA furda-tu fem. “opening in a wall”: Egyp. pr̥d̥ “to divide, separate, split”;

[pr̥k̥]: in Akk. “to split”, Ug. “to break, open”, Aram. “to tear; part”, Mand. “to sever, detach”, BHeb. “to tear apart, tear off, rend”, CA “to separate out”, ESA “to distinguish”, Sab. tfr̥k̥ “be dispersed, scattered” (SD, 46) = CA ta-farraḵ id., Eth. “to divide”. Here also belong Cush.: Ga. fārāḵa “turn” = Har., Amh. fārāḵa id. (EHD, 64): cf. CA ma-fraḵu “place where one turns”, i.e. *point of separation*: Chad.: Bidiya porok “to tear, pluck feathers”, Kera parge id.; fərgi “to dig”;

[pr̥ʾ]: in BHeb. “to break forth, sprout”, CA “to divide (branches) by cutting”, farrāʾa-tu ‘axe’ used for this purpose, Chad.: Migama p̥eru “knife”, Berb.: Zenaga te-feri “sharp tool, sword”, Izayan ta-fru-t id.;

[pr̥y]: in Akk. parū “to cut off”, CA “to cut open, rip”: Chad.: Tangale pure “to prepare field by cutting trees”;

[pr̥m]: in BHeb. “to tear, rend”, CA “to chop up”, Syr. “to cut down”, Chad.: Kera pāram “to sickle”;

[pr̥g]: in CA “to make an opening between”: Chad.: Bidiya p̥irgay “to separate”;



[prd]: in Akk. “to separate”, CA *farada* “to separate, be alone”, Sab. *frd* “alone, uniquely” (= CA *fard id.*), BHeb. “to separate, to spread (the wings)”, Aram., BAram “to separate”, Syr. “to separate”, Mand. “to break through, tear apart”, Eth. *frd* “to judge”;

[prš]: in BHeb. “to spread out, scatter”, CA “to spread out”;

[prk]: in Akk. “to force”, Aram. “to break, smash”, Mand. “discerning”, BHeb. “to crumble”, CA “be separated from, to rub”;

[prh]: in CA “to sprout”, as when we *trim branches, trees*, etc., new branches will sprout, hence in CA CII, BHeb. *Hiph. intrans.* “to put forth buds, leaves, flowers” (OT, 866), Ge. *farha* “to sprout”, Aram. *prh*, Ug. *prh* “flower”, in Egyp. *prh* “flower” also “divide, separate”;

[prz]: in CA “to set apart, separate, sort out” with [przm] “to break apart, split”; Mand. *prz* “to break (through)”, Berb. *frz* “to separate, cut”.

### Comments

Before passing on to other related topics, it may be necessary to indicate that exceptions to the rule are sometimes found. For example, one may find one or more members of a group of kindred triliterals expressing ideas completely different from the general meaning assumed for the group as a whole. Exceptions wherever found are due to one or more of these *surface* processes:

- (1) The adoption of a grammatical affix as a part of the root,
- (2) Compounding or blending of two or more biliteral roots,
- (3) Sound change (*metathesis, assim., dissim., etc.*).

Such processes will be explained and illustrated in this chapter. Moreover, I will also reconsider what I have thus far called ‘*deep structure*’, e.g. [gaz-], [par-], etc., to make sure whether it is or is not ‘*a 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> surface structure*’.

**2.1.9.5** It may be well to close this section with a list of some additional groups of kindred roots.

a) [ṭm-] “to cover”

[ṭmm]: in Akk. “to close (ears)”, Aram., Mand., BHeb. “to close up”, Syr. “to shut”, CA “to cover over, overflow (said of water)”, i.e. the water covers over, Egyp. *tmm* “to close”;

[ṭmr]: in Akk. “to cover, hide, conceal”, Aram. “to cover, bury”, Mand. “to burry”, BHeb. “to hide, conceal”, CA “to bury, conceal”;

[ṭmn]: in BHeb. “to hide, cover”, CA “to feel secure”;

[ṭmš]: in CA “to obscure, make dark”, Mand. “submersion”, Palm. “be inundated”;

[ṭmh]: in CA “darkness”, OffAram, JAram. [ṭmʾ] “impure spirit”, Sab. [ṭmʾ] “defilement, impure”, etc.

b) [lḳ-] “to take, seize”

[lḳḥ]: in Akk. “to take” also “to buy, borrow”, Phoen., OAram. “to take, seize”, Ug. “to take” also “to buy”, Sab. “to seize, capture”. In CA the triliteral has been preserved in *laḳḥa-tu* “land-tax”; *laḳḥu*, the term for a small piece taken from a tree and inserted

under the bark of another tree in order to change its type; hence, as a vb “to pollinate” also “fertilize”;

[lḳṭ]: in Akk. “to snatch away, carry away”, BHeb. “to gather” also “to glean”, OAram. “to glean”, CA “to pick up, capture, gather, glean”, Sab. “to capture, seize”, also Akk. liḳūtu, CA laḳītu “adopted child”;

[lḳḳ] in Akk. “to take, buy, borrow”, BHeb. “to lap (i.e. take with the tongue)”, CA laḳlaḳu “tongue”, as a means of ‘taking by licking’, Amh. “to borrow”;

[lḳm]: CA “to take by the mouth”, Har. lāḳāma “to pick up”, Te. lāḳma id.;

[lḳp]: in CA “to catch, take quickly” (Berb.: Kab. leḳef “to seize”).

Some other roots are CA laḳiya “to find, receive”; ta-laḳḳā (with prep. min ‘from’) “to take from”; malḳā “meeting place”, Nab. mlḳy id., CA [lḳs] “be greedy, gluttonous”, [lḳθ] “to grasp”, [lḳn] “to learn from”, i.e. *take knowledge from*, Har., Amh. [lḳn] “main meal taken by the farmers in the morning”; etc.

### c) [mr-] “to rub”

[mrḥ]: in Akk. “to rub”, BHeb. “to rub”, CA “to rub with oil”;

[mrḥ]: in CA “to anoint”;

[mrʿ]: in CA “to rub with fat to an excess”;

[mrd]: in Akk., CA, Ug., Aram., Sab. “be ill”;

[mrḳ]: in Aram. “to rub”, Mand. “to cleanse”, BHeb. “to clean, scour”, CA “to rub down”. It also signifies “be ill; illness”, esp. in Aram. dialects;

[mrk]: in BHeb. “to polish”;

[mrg]: CA “be restless, disturbed, to corrupt”, SL “rub with oil”, Ge., Tna. mārāgā, Har. mārāga “to plaster”, Amh., Te. mārāgā id.;

[mrṭ]: in BHeb. “make smooth, to polish”, CA “to pluck, pull out, fall off”, OffAram. “to pull out”;

[mrs] in BHeb., Syr., Mand. “to press down, crush down”, CA “to wipe, rub oneself with” also, said of dates, “to rub with water”. In addition, CA [mrṣ], [mrθ]<sup>41</sup> ~ [mrδ] ~ [mrd], etc. express different shades of “to rub”.

### Comments

The only purpose of the following ‘comments’ is to *serve as a prelude to a much more important topic entitled ‘abstract versus special meaning’* in §2.1.10 below. For this reason, it is advised to read them carefully, exactly as you have read ‘groups of roots sharing in common the first two radicals’ above, but without building any theory on them since any theory you see as solid and firm as a rock will crumble away as new evidence emerges.

a) As has been shown above (cf. §2.1.9.5, n. b above), roots beginning with /laḳ-/ express different shades of “take, seize”. By reexamining CA [lḳm], for example, and the idea it conveys, we find that the idea can be easily broken down into two semantic notions: one is ‘take’ and the other is ‘mouth’, and that the triliteral itself is divisible into

<sup>41</sup> Both *maratha* and *mātha* express an identical meaning (MA, 372). This particular /-r-/, which has left a deep and everlasting impress on Hamito-Semitic roots and many other language families, will be dealt with below, esp. in §2.15.

two morphological units /laḵ/ and /-m-/. Since /laḵ-/ expresses “to take”, one may surmise that \*/-m-/, the only radical left from the triliteral, stands for “mouth”. Before elaborating further on this point, the fact must be first recognized that in CA a word expresses a special meaning, and it is just for the sake of simplicity that we usually give an abstract meaning to a CA word. For example, *rabiḥa* “to gain (win) in *commerce*” (nowadays the general term for the abstract “to win”), *saḡlu* “large bucket *full of water*”, but if it is empty, it is called *dalwu*, *ḡassa* “to touch *with the hand*”, *yabaḡa* “to drink fast” (SL *yabb* “swallow (food, water) fast”), *ʿalla* “to drink for the second time”, *yabūḡu* “drinking in *the evening*”, *našaḡa* “to drink *little*, i.e. *without satisfying one’s thirst*”, *ʿauwaha* “take a short nap at dawn”, *kafaḡa* “to meet face to face (and usually by chance)”, *šaḡiḡu* “brother from the same father and mother”, *ḡariḡu* “brother from a different mother”, *ʿaḡyāfu* “brothers from the same mother and different fathers”, *wadḡā(n)* “two brothers”, *ḡaibu* “one’s relatives through his mother; parent, sister, and daughter”, *bašiʿu*, nowadays expresses the abstract idea “ugly”, but the orig. meaning is “harsh, indigestible, (said of food)”, *yaḡā* “to go or depart in the early morning”, *sarā* “to go at night”, *rāḡa* “to go in the evening”, *sāḡa* “to go and come back”, *šaḡara* “lift up its (right) hind leg when urinating (said only of a dog)”, while *šaḡḡu* “lifting up its leg (unspecified) to urinate (said only of a dog)”, *ʿaḡama*, said only of a blind or a non-blind person at night “to search for a thing with *the hand*”, *ḡufāyatu* “empty ship”, but if it is loaded, it is called *yaḡmidu*, and so forth.

A signification like ‘*piece* (that has been separated from a whole)’ can be expressed by *many more than the fifty special terms* cited by Thaʿālbī (FL, p. 210), depending on the nouns they modify as in *fiḡḡa-tu* (of liver), *fiḡra-tu* (of meat), *hanāna-tu* (of fat), *fiḡʿa-tu* (of hide), *lumḡa-tu* (of food), *kisra-tu* (of bread), *ḡubra-tu* (of wheat, corn), *nasfa-tu* (of flour), *kutla-tu* (of dates), *ḡuḡwa-tu* (of soil), *badra-tu* (of gold), *zubra-tu* (of iron), *nuḡra-tu* (of silver), *nabḡu* (of money), *rumma-tu* (of rope), *ʿamīta-tu* (of wool), *fiḡḡa-tu* or *sabiḡa-tu* (of cotton), *ḡiḡḡu* (of grass), *ḡazʿa-tu* (of clouds), *kisfa-tu* (of raining clouds), *haḡiʿu* (of the night), *ḡaḡwa-tu* (of fire), *fiḡḡa-tu* (of sword), *ḡiḡḡa-tu* (of spear), and so forth.

This is, however, not all. The complexity may reach an incredible limit as when we have a word expressing *a special meaning* and simultaneously used as ‘*a cover term*’ for other different words expressing additional *special shades* of that *special meaning* (see §2.1.10, n. 5 below). In brief, this exactly what Classical Arabic is and any conception about it contrary to this fact is *unquestionably wrong and utterly groundless*.

b) In accordance with the fact just established above, a single example, like [lḡm], is not any proof that \*/-m/ signifies “mouth” unless supported by others. The matter is further complicated by the fact that Hamito-Semitic has no existing root /-m-/ denoting “mouth”<sup>42</sup>. The common Semitic root for “mouth” is the biliteral \*pw- as in Akk.,

<sup>42</sup> A root \*-m- “mouth” is attributed by Orel and Stolbova (HSED, n. 1698) to PHS and is found in some Chadic and Berber languages as in Chad.: Bata *mee*, Daba *ma*, Nzangi *ma*, Gidar *mo*, Musgum *ma* id.; Berb: Ghadames *am*, Ahaggar *imi*, Zenaga *immi* id., also So. *imi*, To. *emi* “mouth” (VPHS, 171, n. 380). The presence of this root in such Hamitic dialects is due to sound change, i.e. p > m. PHS \*pū- is also seen in some Chadic languages like Fyer *fo* “mouth”, Bokkos *fo* id. The term for ‘mouth’ in Cush. is similar to that found in Eth. dialects, i.e. *af* (see above), as in Som., Saho, Afar *af*, Sid. *afo*, Hadiya. *afaʿo*, Darasa. *afoʿo*, Bil. *ab*, etc.

Assyr. pū, CA, pū, fūhu, pāhu, Ug. p, BHeb. pe(h), Phoen. p, Pun. py, EHeb. pyh, also CA gen. sg. fīhi, Eth.: Ge., Tna., Te. 'af, Amh., Har., Arg. M., Ms. Etc. af. In Aram. and CA a variant [pm] exists: OAram., BAram. pm, Syr. pūmā, Nab. p(w)m, Mand. puma, CA famu (Gray, 1971: §99; Rabin, 1975: 88; NWSI II, 909; HED, 19; MD, 368). Farāhīdi (Al 'Ayn VIII, 406) derives *famu* from [fwh] and says: /-h/ is dropped, /-w-/, like /y/ and /'/, is dropped in declension, and /m/ was added to support /f/ (in pronunciation).

c) In the foregoing paragraph we have just attempted to prepare the ground for making a decision on whether the trilateral [lkm] is a compound of two elements or not. Assuming [lkm] to be a compound, we should expect to see its second element \*/-m/ in some other trilaterals expressing the same sort of meaning. Otherwise, the association of \*/-m with 'mouth' can be plausibly explained away as coincidental. Consider the following examples:

1) CA [kṭm] as in *ḵaṭama* "take (= cut) grass with the mouth (sheep, etc.), bite with the tips of the front teeth and taste"; *ḵaṭama-tu* "whatever cut with the mouth and thrown away". It seems evident that two basic semantic notions are expressed by [kṭm], one is 'cut' and the other is 'mouth'. If we can prove that the two radicals \*kṭ- express the former notion, we will be correct in assuming that \*/-m-/ signifies the latter. The only way to prove this is to study other trilaterals beginning with \*kṭ- to see whether they share with [kṭm] the basic notion "to cut" or not. Let us examine the basic meaning(s) expressed by such trilaterals.

[kṭṭ]: CA "to cut a solid object, sharpen, trim", BHeb. "to cut, diminish", Ge., Amh. "to cut"; Ge., Tna., Te. *ḵaṭḵaṭā*, Amh. *ḵaṭḵaṭā*, Har. *ḵiṭḵaṭā* "hammer";

[kṭ']: Akk. "to cut", CA "to cut (i.e. the cut things should become distinct from one another)", BHeb., Aram., Syr. "to cut", Meh., Soq. id.;

[kṭp]: Akk., CA "to cut fruit (cull)", BHeb., Syr., Mand. "to cull, cut";

[kṭm]: BHeb. "to cut (the head), extirpate";

[kṭn]: Akk., CA, Aram., BHeb., "small", Sab. "flock of small cattle", Soq., Meh. "thin", Ge., Har., Tna., Te. "make thin";

[kṭl]: CA "to cut off (usually 'trees')"; *ḵuṭulu* "trees cut off from the root" (in BHeb. and all Aram. dialects, except OAram., *ḵṭl* is from [kṭl] "kill");

[kṭš]: CA, dial., "to cut the tail";

[kṭb]: BAram. [kṭb] "to cut", in Eth. "to pierce", BHeb. *ḵeṭeb* "a cutting", CA *ḵaṭaba* "to cut off" and also its contradictory meaning "to bring together, join, bind"; *ḵaṭiba-tu* "altogether, entire", with the latter meaning being the only common one in modern Arabic. Phenomenon of *Addād*, a word expressing two contradictory meanings, will be defined and explained in §2.2.47 below.

2) CA [kmm] as in *kammama* "to gag (i.e. cover the mouth)", *kimāma-tu* "a gag". In this root \*km- signifies "to cover, close" and lies beneath a group of closely related trilaterals such as [kmn] "to hide, cover", [kmh] "blind by birth", [kmy] "to hide, conceal", [kmd] "concealed sadness", [kms] "to shrink", [km'] "to disappear, be ignorant, stupid", etc., BHeb. *kāmas* "to lay up, to hide away", Syr., Mand. [kms] "to hide", BAram., Syr. *kāman* "to hide", BHeb. *kāmar* "to be warm, to grow warm; to burn", Syr., Mand. [kmr] "darkness, obscurity", etc. SL *kamar* "to cover s.t. in order to

keep it warm"; kamkar expresses an intensive meaning.

3) CA [lfm] as in lafama «to veil (= wrap with a veil, scarf, etc.) around one's mouth". Farra' says that «if it (= the veil, etc) reaches the tip of the nose, it is called *lifāmu*, but if it is round the mouth, it is called *liθāmu*» (LA, r. lfm). According to Asma'i (ibid.) «if the veil is wrapped around the mouth, it is (called indiscriminately) *lifāmu* or *liθāmu*». SL CII t-laffam (rare) is a mere variant of t-laθθam "he wrapped a veil round the mouth or face"<sup>43</sup>. It is interesting to note that CA laffa is the word for "to wrap, turn round". On the other hand, the basic meaning of [lθm], as in laθama, is "to kiss" and, as we know, notions of 'kiss' and 'mouth' are so closely related to the extent that they are sometimes expressed by derivatives of the same root: cf. CA fuymu "mouth"; fayama "to kiss", Lat. *ōsculārī* "to kiss" is from *ōs* "mouth", etc.

The foregoing discussion should not give the wrong impression that I am convinced of the earlier presence of a compound consisting of \*lap- "wrap" and \*-m "mouth". As a matter of fact, the word *lap* itself is a compound of [l-] and [-p].

There is no denying, however, that the compound [lap] had existed for many centuries in the remote past as a root in Hamito-Semitic languages and to which they added morphological affixes. For example, all Semitic languages have derived from [lap] a noun *laptu* "turning (round)". In the course of time, /-t/, like almost all other affixes, has become permanently attached to the root in all Semitic languages. The only language that has preserved both [lap] and [lap(a)t] is CA. On the other hand, To enlarge their stock of roots, all Hamito-semitic languages, though in varying proportions, used to shift the radical consonants to form new roots, hence HS [patal] "turn, turn round". See §2.9.2 below.

4) CA ka'ama "to shut the mouth (due to 'fear' or to 'something put in it') also "to kiss". Note that \*ka'- as in ka'a means "to imprison, confine";

5) CA qa'amu "crookedness in the mouth": cf. CA qa'aw "a kind of hook".

6) CA faḡamu "distortions in the shape of the mouth, i.e. the upper and lower jaws are unequal and the upper and lower incisors do not come in touch when one closes his mouth": cf. CA faḡḡa "make an opening between". To my understanding, however, the word could be from {fak + \*-mu}, bearing in mind the following facts:

6a) the sequence /fkm/ is not a phonotactic possibility,

6b) the combination of the meanings of [fak] and \*-mu = the precise meaning of *faḡamu* as stated and explained above, i.e. *fakka* "to open, part, separate", *fakku* "jaw" and \*-m

Another variant {fg- + -m} exists, but of rare usage, as in faḡamu "coarse mouth", SL fažžam "to strike and injure one's head, apparently orig. 'one's mouth', since fawžam "yell at aloud using aggressive words". Note that faḡ- and faḡ- express a similar meaning.

7) CA haṭmu "a beak of a bird, front of the mouth and nose of any animal" (LA, r. ḥṭm), ḥiṭāmu "a muzzle", BHeb. ḥṭm "to muzzle an animal" also "nose, beak" (OT, 308; HSED, n. 1340). By infixing -r-, we get CA hurṭūmu "nose (also mouth) of an elephant" (ML II, 251).

---

<sup>43</sup> For the interchange of /θ/ and /f/, see §2.17.54 below.

8) CA 'akama, said of a beast of burden, "to wrap its mouth" ~ ka'ama above.

9) CA razama, said of a she-camel, "to utter a sound without opening the mouth": cf. CA rizzu, from rikzu "a sound you hear but you don't know what it is or where it comes from" as in the PIP of Labid:

«wa tawaġġasat rizza [or rikza] ('a)l 'anīsi farā'ahā

'an ḡahri yaibin wa ('a)l 'anīsu siḡāmuhā».

The form rikza > rizza by progressive assimilation of \*-k-, which has changed its manner and place of articulation to match that of the following /-z-/. The original form is seen in the Koran: (هل تحس منهم من أحد أو تسمع لهم ركزا) , *Do you find out any one of them (anywhere)? or do you hear (even) a hidden voice of them?* (14:98). Thu Ar Rimmaḥ says:

«'iḏā tawaġġasa rikzan min ḥawāfirihā... » (ṢḤḤ V, 2038).

False cognates are BAram. rāz "secret, mystery" (Rosenthal, 1963:95), Syr. rwz id. (OT, 972), etc. For a further analysis of [rkz], see §2.4.22, n. c below.

10) CA daḡmu "one with upper and lower jaws drawn closely to each other, one who speaks while his mouth is almost closed".

All these surface examples *may or may not* hint at a proot \*-m- having to do with the 'mouth'. Rationally speaking, the examples are undoubtedly significant and suggestive, but cannot be used *at all* as a solid ground on which we raise a theory of far-reaching effects on Hamito-Semitic root system unless we can scientifically prove, as logic and reasoning demand, that every third radical in the groups of kindred roots cited thus far (like g-z-, pr-, pl-, lḡ-, etc.) has, like /-m/, its well-defined meaning or grammatical function. As a matter of fact, it is the whole aim of the present research is to decompose the traditional root into its ultimate component elements, though *we are not in rush to do that*.

11) It is impossible to decompose a root with 'absolute certainty' without knowing its *original part of speech*, its *earliest signification* and the *phonetic nature* of all elements of the combination which are not always as plain and evident as the following examples from Egyp and CA may suggest:

a) Egyp. [hw] signifies "be in want, to lack"; suffixing /-ḡ/ to it results in a triliteral [hwḡ] signifying "hungry, to hunger". The original meaning of the triliteral is "empty + food". For the underlying meaning of [haw], see §2.16 below, and for [-ḡ], see §2.9.27 & §2.17.46 below.

b) CA ḥaḏa' "weakness of the soul ('self)": CA \*-ḏa' underlies ḏā-tu fem. "self; soul, spirit". For [ha] (< haw), see §2.16 below.

### 2.1.10 ABSTRACT VERSUS SPECIAL MEANING

CA words, as we have seen above, express special meanings. Before attempting to *explain* this phenomenon, it may important to give some additional examples elucidating different aspects of the same phenomenon so that the whole picture will become clear to the reader. Consider the very special meaning expressed by each of the following group of kindred triliterals:

lakaḥja "to strike with the open hand";

lakaθa “to strike with the hand or foot”;  
 laka’a “to strike with a whip”;  
 lakaza “to strike with the fist all over the body”;  
 lakada “to strike with the hand and push”;  
 lakama “to strike with the fist (box)”;  
 laka’a “to strike gently on the udder or breast”;  
 lakka (\*lakaka) “to strike on the back”  
 lakaša (in Leb. and other dialects) “to strike a light blow with the fingertip”.

It is just sufficient to observe that none of the above-cited trilaterals can express the mere abstract idea ‘*strike*’; each expresses only a very special meaning of that idea<sup>44</sup>.

Another example may be the term for ‘*ant*’ in the language which is *nam(u)la*-tu fem. sg. and is derived, *just like nearly all other words for animals, plants, etc.*, from a collective noun *namlu* “ants” by suffixing the fem. sg. /-tu/ ending. In Semitic languages the cognate is either with final /-t/ as in BHeb. *nmlh* fem. (= CA *namlah* in *pause*, where -t- is regularly -h) or without -t as in Akk. *namālu* = CA pl. of the pl. *nimālu* id. Besides this term, there are many other terms denoting different characteristics and types of ants, terms for their family relationships, etc. such as *rimma*-tu “winged ant”<sup>45</sup>, *gaθla*-tu “black ant”, *huwwa*-tu “red ant”, *hirθā* coll. “ants somewhat red”, *samāma*-tu “a type of red ant that bites severely”, *ḍarru* “small ants that bite” (= SL the smallest type of *blond ants*), *hunābiḡu* coll. “small (baby) ants”, *ḡu’bā* “a type of ants”, *du’ā’a*-tu “black winged-ant”, *du’būbu* or *du’ābu* coll. “a type of black ants”, *ṭaθraḡu* coll. “a type of ants”, *ḥaḍālu* id. (LA, r. d’b), *mūku* coll. “winged ants”, *šaiṣabānu* “male of ants”, *māzinu* coll. “ant’s eggs”, *duḡā* “young (lit. babies) of ants”, *uḡrūfu* “a kind of ants with long legs”, while *dabdaba*-tu is a term describing *how* ‘*uḡrūfu* walks, etc. According to Ibin Barri (in LA, r. ‘ḵf), *uḵfā*-nu “grandfather of black ants” and *fāziru* “grandfather of blond ants”. For other animals (*snake, horse, etc.*) and things in the physical world (*cloud, water, stone, etc.*), verbs (*eat, drink, run, walk, break, cut, etc.*) the list of special terms will surely be so much longer.

1) Another typical example may be *ṣautu*, the most widely used term for “sound” (for its cognates in Hamito-Semitic, see §2.21.3.1, n. 4 below). Besides this term, CA has hundreds of special terms for different sounds produced by various creatures and natural

<sup>44</sup> The very same phenomenon is found in many world’s languages with different proportions (see, for example, Otto Jespersen, 1964: XXI §10 and Nancy Lord in V. Clark, P. Eschholz, and A. Rosa (eds), 1998: 23), etc., but it reaches its peak in CA and this is due to its *unmatched conservatism*. Jespersen (ibid.) sees that

“the more advanced a language is, the more developed is its power of expressing abstract or general ideas. Everywhere language has first attained to expressions for the concrete and special”.

Jespersen’s view as expressed in his *equational sentence* above is wrong. The phenomenon can only be explained in terms of *language change* and it has nothing to do *at all* with ‘*cultural advancement*’, a term with which some scholars are infatuated (see §2.25 below).

<sup>45</sup> Akk. *rimmatu* “ant”, Cush.: Oromo *rimma* “ant, termite”, Saho *rimme* “worm”, Chad.: ‘iririmo “insect” (HSED, n. 2119).

elements. There are also special terms denoting the quality of a sound, its range of intensity, or the event that calls for its production. For example, *nubāḥu* “sound uttered by a dog” (gen. Semitic [nbḥ] id.), *ḏuḡā’u* “sound uttered by a dog when it is hungry”, *harīru* “sound uttered by a dog when it sees something or someone unfamiliar or repulsive”, and so on. Another example may be *ṣahīlu* “sound uttered by a horse” (= BHeb., Syr., etc. ṣhl id.), *ḏabḥu* “sound uttered by a horse when it runs and breathes heavily”, *ḳab’u* of a horse = *harīru* of a dog above, and so forth.

2) Besides the term *ša’ru* coll. pl. “hair” (gen. HS \*š’r id.), there are tens of words expressing ‘special hair’ such as *ḏu’āba-tu* “hair (of back of the head)”, *masraba-tu* “hair (of the chest)”, *ṡafaru* “hair on a woman’s leg”, *dababu* “hair on a woman’s face”, *waḡra-tu* “hair (of the ear)”, *waḡafu* “bushy eyebrows or eye-lashes” (the term for “eye-lashes” is *hudubu*), *ḳūfu* “neck-hair”, *šāribu* “hair on the upper lip (moustache)”, *anḳafa-tu* “hair on the lower lip”, *far’u* “head-hair (of a women)” (SL farra’a-t, said of a woman, “uncover the head-hair”, the deep meaning is the same as *bi š šūšī*, said of woman “uncovering her hair”: CA \*šu- “forelock, lock of hair”, Egyp. šw “hair”, sš “hair, tress, lock” (see §2.17.83.15 below), CA *ru’šūšu* [r’š] “one having much hair on the ear”, and so forth.

Numerous words denoting how the ‘hair looks like’ also exist. For an old reference dealing with this subject, see Tha’ālibi (FL) and the references he cites, but bearing in mind that any list Tha’ālibi gives for special verbs, nouns, adjectives is most certainly *incomplete*, and that the meaning he assigns to a term is not always precise. Accordingly, one has to consult earlier references and dictionaries on the meaning of the term. We can therefore enrich any of his lists with many other special terms. For example, we can add to his list of special terms for ‘hair’ and ‘how it looks like’ so many others such as *falīla-tu*, *failamu*, *fainānu*, *ša’iḡu*, *ḡa’idu*, *ḡaḡanu*, *šawa’u* (comp. with *ša’ru*), *ufwa-tu* “head-hair”; *āft* “with long hair”, *ḳafaru*, *unṣuwa-tu*, *ḳunza’a-tu*, and so on.

3) Although there should be no doubt that CA special terms are made up of native elements according to Hamito-Semitic word formation processes as we will discover below, and that such elements are found in a scattered manner in Hamito-Semitic language divisions as will be illustrated throughout the sections below, yet it seems unreasonable to ascribe *all of them* to Proto-Hamito-Semitic. In other words, only ‘most of them’<sup>46</sup> did indeed exist in Proto-Hamito-Semitic, and this is evidenced by the fact that their cognate words are found in different Hamito-Semitic language divisions. For example, *ḡumma-tu* “head-hair” has cognates in sister languages as in Cush.: Ga. *gamma* “mane, woman’s hair plaited like a cap”, PChad.: \*g-m- “beard”, etc. (Müller, 1975: 68, n. 55). Another CA special term for “hair” is *falīla-tu* above “curly hair, mass of hair” (LA), in Old Huthaiyil dialect “hair” (Al ‘Ayn VIII, 316), with m-ext.: *failamu* above = lit. ‘great *gumma-tu*’ also ‘large comb’ (the root is preserved SL as a verb *falla* “to search for lice in the head-hair”). Its Cush. cognate is *fila* “comb” as in Ga., Sa., Dar. *fila*, Z. *filä*, Som. *fiḏin* id. (HED, 62), *fai’u* = Egyp. f’, f’i “hair” (EHD I, 258), CA

<sup>46</sup> The term ‘most of them’ is used here only to allow CA to develop very few words on its own way.



**ša'fa**-tu “haarlocke” (its precise meaning is ‘top of the head-hair’ and may extend to “lock of hair”), Meh. *šfīt* “haar”, Šahj. *šfēt*, Soq. *ša'f*, *šfeh* id., Chad.: Sura *shwoop* “haar”, Mon. *súwēep* id., Maha *šofi*, Montol *swēp* id., Berb.: Iznasen *azäf* “hair”, Cush.: Oromo *sapii* “pubic hair” (Müller, 1975: 64, n. 4; HSED, n. 529), 'a-**šyabu** “grey-headed”; šāba “to have grey hair” = Heb. šyb, Aram., BAram., Syr., Talm. syb id., Ge. *šebä*, Har. *šibät*, Tna., Te. šyb, etc. (OT, 1009; HED, 144), Chad.: Kabalay *ke-sebo* “hair” (HSED, 467), **hulbu** “the whole hair, hair (on the tail), coarse hair (on the body)”: 'ahlabu adj. “having coarse hair” = Cush.: Som. *halab* “long coarse hair”, etc. (HED, 82), **sabibu** “ringlet of hair” also “hair on the tail and the fore part of the head (often of a horse)” = Eyp. sb-t “lock of hair, tress” (EHD I, 594), Berb.: Izdig *a-šbab* “eyebrow”, Kabyl *a-šabšub* “hair-lock”, *a-səbbub* “hair”, **faudu** “head-hair next to the ear, i.e. side of the head-hair” = Ug. pd “locks (of hair)” (UG, 534), Mand. *futa* “forehead”, CA **zababu** “hairy (of the arms and eyebrows)” = OYem. zabb “beard” (Al 'ayn VII, 353), Cush.: Oromo *daabee*, *dēbb-* “hair”, Eyp. zb-t “hair-lock”, Chad.: Zenaga 'a-zbi “hair”, (HSED, n. 2602), CA **far'u** “head-hair (usually of women)”; 'afra'u adj. (the opposite of 'ašla'u “hairless”), etc. above = BHeb. *pera'* “hair, locks”; *pāra'* “make naked”, BAram., Talm. pr' id. (OT, 868), **ḏafira**-tu “plait, braid” = Ge. *ḏāfr* “braid”, SA: Jib. *ḏfr* “plait”, Cush.: Oromo *ifra* “women's hairdo”, Konso *irf-* id., Gidar *čirf* “braid”, Chad.: Housa *fe* “comb(beard)”, Bid *dyeepir* “kind of pubic hair”, 'isbu “pubic hair” = Cush.: Sid. *šoobba*, Hadiya *soomba* id., **šaḡru** “beard, chin” = Ge. *šägʷər*, Tna. *šägʷri* “hair”, Har. *čigär* “hair”, Te. *čägər*, Amh. *ṭägur*, etc.<sup>47</sup>. Cush.: Som. Bil. *sugur*, Som. *dogor* id., etc. (HED, 50).

4) It is worth-noting that such CA special terms are likewise found across world's language families. Some illustrations from Indo-European are: CA **gmm** above = Lat. coma “hair”, Grk *kōmē* id.; **ḡafilu** ~ **ḡufālu** “wool, abundant and unkempt hair” = Lat. capillus “head-hair”; **kurzula**-tu “tuft of hair on the head of women” = Lat. crīnis “hair”, from \*cris-ni: Lat. crista “tuft on the head of animals”; **kušša**-tu fem. “forelock, tuft or ringlet of hair”, SL *kaššiš* “woman's head-hair, usu. *coarse hair* (pejorative)” = Lith. *kasa* “tress, braid of hair”, OCS. *česati* “to comb”, etc.; CA **limma**-tu “long hair, usu. *extending to the shoulder*” = Skt. *loman-*, *roman-* “hair (of the body)”, Ir. *rūainne* “hair”, Br. *reun* “coarse hair”; CA **šḡr** “beard, chin” above = OE. *sceaga* “rough hair”, ON. *skegg* “hair”; CA **fl** above (in addition to *wa-flu*, perh. “hide or skin hair” (ML VI, 129) = Lat. *pilus* “hair”, *pilleus* “felt, cap”, Grk *solîp* “felt”, and so forth. It is worth-noting here that such pairs of words reveal not only systematic and regular correspondences between similarly sounding words with the same sort of meaning, but also a deep affinity in other meanings, notably basic meanings, expressed by the roots, i.e. both CA **fl** and IE \*pil- = “feel of”, both CA **šḡr** and Germ. (ON.) *skōgr* = “tree”, and so forth.

5) In keeping with special terms for “hair”, one should expect the language to have many other special terms for ‘*lacking hair*’ on different parts of the body, hence 'a-**šla'u** “lacking hair on the top of the head from front to back”, 'a-**kra'u** “baldheaded” = BHeb. *krh* “bald-head” (OT, 942), 'a-**ḡlahu** [ḡlh] “lacking hair on the forehead” = BHeb. *glh*

<sup>47</sup> For the irregularity of sound correspondence between CA /š/ and Eth. /s/, see §2.2.48, esp. n. 2 below.

“be bald”, *Piel*. “to shave the head, shave off, cut off hair” (OT, 194), Aram.: Jp. *gallaḥ* “raser”, Ge. *glḥ* “être rasé, visible”, Te. *gālḥa* “être chauve”, Tna. *glḥ* “raser la tête” Cush.: Som. *galaḥi* “baldness”, Bil. *galh-ay* “be bald”, etc. (DRS III, 123; HSED, n. 950).

According to Abu Ubaid (see LA), **’a-ġlaḥu** above actually signifies “lacking hair on the sides of the forehead”, and he cites four different terms corresponding to the degrees of baldness in that position: first degree, i.e. *the beginning of baldness* = **’a-nza’u**, next (in backward direction, i.e. *from back to front*) **’a-ġlaḥu**, then **’aġā** (= half bald), finally **’a-ġlahu** = BHeb. *gālāh* “be bald” (OT, 192), Te., Tna. *glḥ* “chauve, rasé” (DRS III *ibid.*), also Te. *gəluḥ* “au front dégarni”, Tna., Amh. *glḥ* “clair, évident” (DRS III, 120) *id.* A distinction should be made between *a term expressing a special meaning* and *a term functioning as ‘a cover’* for more terms expressing *special details* of the ‘cover term’.

The word **’a-ġlaḥu** above is an example of *a special term used as a cover term for a number of additional special-meanings*. For another interesting example, see §2.24.15, *ft.* <sup>1</sup> below.

Among other terms expressing *special meaning* are **’a-mraṭu** [mrṭ] “lacking hair on the eyebrow”; *marāṭa* “to pluck out (hair)”, BHeb. *māraṭ* “make bald” also “make smooth, polish” (OT, 617), **’a-mlaṭu** “lacking hair on the body and head”; *malāṭa* “to shave”, Heb. (hit)*malleṭ* “seem bald”, Ge. *mālāṭā* “render bare, strip off”, Har. *mālāṭa*, Tna. *mālāṭā*, Te. *mālṭa*, etc. (HED, 107), **’a-m’aṭu** [m’ṭ] “lacking hair on the eyelid”; *ma’aṭa* (= *marāṭa* above) “to pluck out (hair)”; BHeb. *mə’uṭā* adj. fem. “smooth, bare” (OT, 596), **’a-ṭaṭṭu** “lacking hair on the cheek or side of the face”, **’a-mradu** [r. mrd] “lacking hair on the cheeks; beardless”, **’a-ṭā** “one having rough, matted, and repulsive hair”, **’a-m’aru** “baldheaded”, but it also denotes “with little head-hair”, just like **’a-z’aru** (Al ‘Ayn II, 139), **sanūṭu** ~ **sunāṭu** “(one who is) beardless, lacking hair on the face”, and so forth.

Among many other terms for “to pluck out (hair), to shave” is *salata* *id.*, clearly from *salla*, hence CVIII *’insalata* = *’insalla* “move s.t. out quietly and stealthily” *lit. as you do with a single thread from a dress or hair from dough* (Al ‘Ayn VII, 192) = Har. *šēlāda* “to shave”, Amh. *šällātā* “to cut hair”, S. *šēlādā* “to shave”, Z. *šīlādā* “to cut hair”, etc. (HED, 145). Prefixing *n-* to CA [sl] gives rise to a new triliteral [nsl], said of a thread, “to come out from the dress by itself”, said of feathers, “to molt, fall off (hair)”, BHeb. [nšl] (see §2.11.6 below). The /n-/ is clearly understood as being a reflexive prefix, and the difference in use between *sall* and *nasal* becomes clear from these sentences: The threads (of a garment) *nasala-t*, but never \*the threads *sallat*.

There are still many other cases in which CA preserved a conspicuous trace of a word for ‘hair’ found in other HS language divisions, e.g.

a) Egyp. *gmš* “hair, tress” (EHD II, 808) = CA **ġamšu** “cutting off the hair”, Ug. *gmš* “bare, naked”;

b) Egyp. *sm* “hair, hairy temples”, OCopt. *smau* “temple” (EHD II, 667), Chad.: Housa *sūmā* “growth of hair”, Ngamo som “hair”, Tangale *simī-* “pubic hair”, Cush.: Yamma *somme* “hair”, Iraqw *se’em id.* (HSED, 481) = CA *mi-smā-tu* fem. “socks or shoes made of wool” (LA);

c) Egy. *ḏ*’ “hair” (HED II, 897), Akk. *ṣerretu* “whiskers” (< \**ṣwr-*, by regressive assimilation), Chad.: Housa *ṣōrō* “hair” (HSED, n. 452) = CA *ṣauru* “the desire to itch one’s head (i.e. *hair*) and search for lice”, and so forth.

6) What has been given in the foregoing paragraphs is, in fact, preparatory to a question of far-reaching consequences not only on HS family of languages, but also on all other language families, as well as on our views of human language and various theories that have been built upon it: *Is the special meaning expressed by a CA word a survival or later development?*

It is beyond question a survival, and the emergence of a comparatively very few words expressing abstract meanings in the language is definitely a product of semantic change. This statement unambiguously tells that all Hamito-Semitic words originally express special meanings, and that the presence of Hamito-Semitic cognates for CA words is by itself ample evidence. For example, the meaning expressed by CA masc. coll. *ša’ru* above has developed from a special meaning “hair of the head and body (hair of upper body)”; hence the adj. *’aš’aru* “hairy, of the body and head” (Al ‘Ayn I, 250; LA); *ša’ratu* can be coll. or sg. = Assy. *šārtu* “hairy skin” (= CA *ša’iru* id.), BHeb. *šā’ār* “hair” (also “hair of the pudenda” = CA *ši’ra-tu* id.), Syr. *sa’rā* “hair”, Eth. *šə’rat* id. (Shehadeh, 1968: 118; OT, 1015), Ug. *š’r-t* “wool” also “hair” (UG, 533, 537). The Egyp. cognate is *s’rty* “hair of an animal, goat’s hair” (EHD II, 635), Chad.: Housa *šāri* “hair on the chest of a ram”, Maji *saaru* “hair” (HSED, n. 528).

7) In addition to words denoting ‘a special finger’ or ‘part of finger’, to take another example, like *hinšaru*, *binšaru*, *sabāba-tu*, *’ibhāmu*, *banā-nu*, *baš’u*<sup>48</sup>, *’unmula-tu*, *barğama-tu*, *rāğiba-tu*, *sulāmā*, *’ašāgi’u pl.*, *san’u*, and so forth<sup>49</sup>, CA has, like its sister languages, a surface abstract term *’išba’u* ~ *’uṣba’u* (a 3<sup>rd</sup> variant *’aṣba’u* exists) for “finger” = Ug. *uṣb’-t* id. (UG, 531), Sab. *ṣb’* id. (SD, 140), BHeb. *’eṣba’*, BAram. *’eṣba’*, Eth. *’aṣbā’et* id. (OT, 81): PSem. \**ṣb’-* = Berb. *adaḏ* “finger” = Cush.: Ag., Bil. *ibi’* “finger”, Bed. *gība*, Ga. *ḳuba* id. (VPHS 147, n. 310). Like Berb., Egyp. *ḏb’* “finger” (EG, 604) shows an initial /ḏ/ rather than /ṣ/. All are from a PHS compound word consisting of, at least, two elements: a stem [ḏub-] “finger” and proot [’-] “hand”, and expressing a special meaning (see §§2.17.30, 2.17.38 below). For the interchange of /ḏ/ and /ṣ/, see §2.12.1, n. 4a below. It becomes clear that the HS word for ‘finger’ was not an abstract term.

8) Since nearly all nouns and adjectives can be converted into verbs in CA (see §2.10.14, n. 1 below for illustrations), it is not surprising to find the stem [ḏub] capable of being converted into a verb *ḏabba* “to milk with five fingers”, orig. “to do s.t. with the five fingers; hold and press s.t. with the five fingers; to put the five fingers around something”, hence *ḏabbu* “to hold something with the palm of the hand and the five fingers”. As we get to this deep (not *deepest*) analysis of a stem, we should not be

<sup>48</sup> Comp. with (’i)ṣba’u and note that one of the common processes of ‘creating new roots’ in Semitic in general and CA in particular is to shift the order of radical consonants. For this phenomenon, see §2.2.51 below.

<sup>49</sup> There are still many words having to do with different joints, movements, positions, and usages of the fingers like *ḳaḳ’u*, *ḳab’u*, *ḳaṣ’u*, *’aḡsu*, *ḏaffu*, *ḏabḏu*, *kaḏḏatu*, etc.

surprised to find that the phonetic differences between, say /b/ and /f/, is neutralized: cf. [df] = [db], and that the intimate interrelationships between the discovered biliteral and tens of triliterals and quadriliterals, such as [dbr], [dbt], [dbθ], and [dbtr], which have evolved from it in the course of millennia are still clear and obvious on the phonological, morphological, and semantic levels. This suggests that the change has been systematic in the sense that it has been carried out in a step-by-step procedure and characterized by purposeful regularity. Otherwise *it would be impossible to observe the change and account for it*.

### 2.1.11 *Meaning and Type of the Root-Determinative*

The question at this point naturally arises: *Does a root-determinative have a meaning?* In following Semitists, I have so far used a root-determinative as an affix having no known meaning of its own, but only a very limited function, serving as an element of derivation, i.e. *deriving a trilateral from a biliteral stem*. As we have noted, any Semitic consonant can be a root-determinative. This view is preposterous for two weighty reasons:

a) There is nothing in a language, esp. *a language like CA*, without a linguistic purpose or function. The fact that we may not know the function or meaning of a linguistic element must be understood only as *the element has a function or meaning, but we do not know it or we have not yet been able to discover it*.

b) Everything in a language has a definite meaning or grammatical function, and in all languages meaningful elements are combined in a systematic way and according to combinatory rules proper to each language. *Is it for this reason languages can be both described and learned, one may ask*<sup>50</sup>?

The obvious fact is that there are *no root-determinatives*, as defined above, in Semitic languages and their Hamitic sisters, and that Hamito-Semitic languages had two types of morphemes, *the bound* and *the free*, which have both become permanently attached to the biliteral and uniliteral roots *in some or all of their occurrences*, depending on the language (division) being considered. A consideration of this fact shows that *distribution* and *type of morphemes* are crucial factors in determining both their meanings and grammatical functions. It will therefore be necessary to begin first with a classification of *Hamito-Semitic morphemes*.

1) It is customary to classify morphemes into two types: *free and bound*, depending on whether they can or cannot occur as separate words. A *free morpheme* can stand alone as an independent word, such as CA *bād* “to perish”, while a *bound morpheme* cannot stand alone as an independent word but must be attached to another morpheme such as the CA causative prefix ‘a- in ‘*abād* “cause to perish”, which can only occur attached to a free morpheme. Generally speaking, this type of classification is valid so far as the investigation is limited to one HS language and to the surface structure of its root, but of little significance when our aim is to discover and study its cognates in other HS languages and determine the form underlying the surface one. Accordingly, another

---

<sup>50</sup> I will be proved in §2.25 below that this is not at all the reason.

classification of morphemes becomes necessary.

2) The classification of a morpheme into *bound* and *free* in the HS family of languages is hampered by the intricate and complicated historical developments of the morpheme itself in various HS languages. What may be identified as a free morpheme in one HS language and only in some of its occurrences, e.g. Egyp. [ʾak] (§2.1.6.5 above), is found to be an inseparable part of the root in all other sister languages. The same holds true for a bound morpheme, e.g. CA caus. prefix ʾa-, as in ʾabāda above, is *bound* in some of its occurrences only, but *part* of the root in CA and the entire HS languages (see §2.3.1 below). Another illustrative example is HS caus. ša-, appearing as a prefix in some language divisions and suffix in some others, occurs both as *bound* and as *part* of the root in the entire HS languages without any exceptions (§2.2. below).

3) A consideration of facts just shown above leads us to make a rule of three major steps:

3a) Any ‘bound morpheme’ found in Hamito-Semitic is originally a separate word having a clear and well-defined meaning and, in the course of time, it has been reduced to a mere affix functioning as derivational or inflectional. However, our primary focus will be on derivational affixes. Among such morphemes are: /š-/ , /ʾ-/ , /y-/ , /h-/ , /m-/ , /n-/ , /t-/ , t-/ , /-t/ , /w-/ , /b-/ , and /ʾ-/ . Each of these root-morphemes will be studied below, starting with /š-/ in §3.2 below.

3b) With the notable exception of very few morphemes like *perh. pū* “mouth”, but not *binu* “son”, *mutu* “man, husband”, and the like, which are originally compounds of a number of elements , any morpheme we identify as ‘free’ in one Hamito-Semitic language is found to be *bound* in all other sister languages. For example, Egyp. free morpheme [ʾaʾ] “great, chief, mighty, grand, lofty” is seen as part of the root in the entire Hamito-Semitic languages, including Egyp. itself, where the morpheme is attached to the root in some of its occurrences (see §2.14 below).

3c) The most common forms noted in HS are what we may call ‘bound form’, which-like bound morphemes- cannot stand alone, they are always annexed to other morphemes. For example, HS compound \*ḏubʾu “finger” consists of a bound form \*ḏub- “finger” and [-ʾ-] “hand” (§2.1.10, n. 8 above). The second element \*-ʾ- here is a bound proot; it can occur as a free morpheme [ʾaʾ] only in Egyp. Its occurrence in other Hamito-Semitic languages is always restricted to compounds (see §§2.17.30 & 2.17.38 below).

The foregoing illustration of ‘the rule’ leaves the impression that terms like ‘biliteral’, ‘triliteral’, and their ramifications are originally foreign to Hamito- Semitic, and that morphology is ultimately a later development in early Proto-Hamito-Semitic; only in the sense that the earliest people who spoke this language were fully aware that the morphological affixes they used to form words were originally independent words . However, the discussion below , starting from § 3.2 onward, will prove or disprove the truth of this impression.

## 2.1.12 Methodology

In trying to analyze Semitic trilaterals, we face complicated problems of three major

types:

- i) first, *the proot underlying any Semitic trilateral recurs in many other trilaterals*,
- ii) second, *to search out for all such trilaterals and locate precisely the proot in them is a hard task and time consuming*,
- iii) and third, *it appears to be impossible to determine the phonological structure of the proot and its oldest signification without studying all such trilaterals*.

To overcome such problems, *one of several approaches* I use is to follow closely Ibin Jinni's theory of '*major derivation*' (as will be outlined and illustrated with sufficient examples in §2.2.51 below) and adopt *a semantic approach* that involves an in-depth study of all possible trilaterals that we can obtain when we shift the order of the root radicals. Illustrative examples are:

1) OAram. [k̄tl] "kill", etc. (see §2.8.25 below), for example, contain an affix, but we cannot tell with certainty whether it is a prefix, suffix, or infix. To transform uncertainty to certainty in a way that satisfies the strictest demands of scientific linguistics, the following criteria are *when necessary* adopted:

1a) The use of a '*semantic test*' involves two concomitant steps: *first*, a careful study of all roots sharing with [k̄tl], for example, *the first two radicals* (e.g. [k̄td], [k̄t'], etc.), *the first and third radicals* (e.g. [k̄lp], [k̄ld], etc.), *the second and third radicals* (e.g. [tl'], [tlk̄], etc.), *the third and first radicals* (e.g. [lk̄p], [lk̄m], etc.), *and the third and second radicals* (e.g. [lt-]). *The objective of the test is to determine with which group of roots the trilateral [k̄tl] coincides semantically on a biliteral basis*.

This part of the criterion is *perh.* valid for a very limited number of Semitic trilaterals whose underlying biradical forms may not include a semivowel. But, when one of the two underlying radicals had been lost as a result of phonetic change in the long processes of adding morphemes (free or bound) to the biradical at one stage and then attaching them permanently to it at a following stage, this *step* of the criterion becomes insufficient by itself for unveiling the true biradical. For example, the six shifts of Sem. trilateral [n̄ṣb] "to erect, raise" or [šmr] "to watch, guard" do not yield any convincing result. The reason for this failure is obvious; the underlying biradical had included a semivowel, which had later been lost in the course of time (for their ultimate origins, see n. 1e below). This limitation of the first step can be compensated for by *the second step*, which checks the correctness of the result obtained from the six shifts and offers a close examination of all relevant weak roots.

1b) Examination of the developments of the potential biliteral, *first* in Semitic languages taking into account the possible adoption of an affix as part of the root and sound change, and *second* in other Hamito-Semitic language divisions.

1c) We shed light, whenever possible, on the relationship that may seem to hold between the newly established biliteral and other Semitic roots.

By applying the criteria just set forth above to [k̄tl], we find that Ug. uses another affix /š-/ , a caus. prefix (see §3.2 below), as a part of the root, thus [š̄kl] = OAram. [k̄tl] "to kill". Both the semantic test with its two parts and Ug. evidence correctly point to the fact that neither /-t-/ nor /š-/ is part of the root. Further evidence comes from CA ḵalā, used with the head, "to behead", i.e. *kill*, and from Cush. ḵala "to kill". This CA word seems to be cognate with Akk., Aram. m̄ḵlw "holocaust" (NWSI II, 679).

The older form has been preserved intact in CA: Poet. *ḵul-nā bihi* “we (= -nā) killed (= *ḵul-*) *him* (-*bihi*)” (LA). The root is also seen in CA *muḵlitu* “one (i.e. *mother*) with no surviving children” as if she *tu-ḵlitu-hum*, i.e. *she kills them*; *ḵaltu*, like *ḵatlu*, expresses “death, killing” (Amāli II, p. 236).

1d) One may note from the last example in the foregoing paragraph that CA also has [ḵlt] “to kill”. There is indeed a perplexing phenomenon in CA and other Semitic languages that manifests itself in that shifting the order of radical consonants may not always affect the basic meaning of the root. Because the phenomenon is widespread in Semitic, esp. in CA, I have finally found myself obliged to acquaint the reader with Ibin Jinni’s theory of *major derivation* (see §2.2.51 below). For this particular /-t/ in Semitic trilaterals, see §2.9 below.

1e) By applying the criteria set forth above to [nṣb] and [šmr] (n. 1a above), with find that they are from proots \*n- + [šaW] + \*-b and \*š- + [maW] + \*-r respectively (W = semivowel): see below §§2.11.42 & 2.2.15 respectively.

3) Akk. *zarū* “to scatter, winnow, sow seeds”, Ug. dry, BHeb. *zārā* “to disperse, winnow”, Jp., Syr. *derā*, Mad. *dra id.*, Eth. *zaraya* “to disperse” (DRS IV, 340), *ḍarā* or *ḍaraya* “to scatter, disperse, winnow”, etc. all are from [ḍry].

Semitic had, like all Hamitic language divisions, a bound morpheme \*š- prefixed to a stem to denote a causative meaning (see §2.2 below). Some Semitic languages, like Akk., Ug., etc. have preserved the bound morpheme only in some of its occurrences, but in other occurrences it has become part of the root. In all other Semitic languages the bound morpheme has become part of the root in all of its occurrences. This clarification enables us to see the origin of CA /s-/ in the following CA trilateral.

The combination of Semitic caus. \*š- (> CA s-) and [ḍry] gives rise in CA to a sequence \*sḍr, which is impossible to pronounce. For this reason, the trilateral \*sḍr does not exist in the language. Accordingly, CA \*sḍr > šḍr and the original biliteral is still seen in CA *ḍarḍara* by reduplication “to disperse and scatter”, Ge. *zarzara*, Tna. *zārzārā*, Amh. *zārāzzārā*, Gour. *zarāzzārā* “to disperse, to scatter” (DRS IV, 340).

On the other hand, Semitic languages use a prefix m- to form the participle (see §2.10 below), as in CA *maḍriy* “scattered”, from [ḍry]. Like caus. s- above, m- has also become a part of the root, thus giving rise to a new trilateral [mḍr] as in CV *ta-maḍḍara* “be scattered”.

4) It is important to note that in some cases the same bound affix may appear initially, medially and finally in the root. Nearly all initial grammatical affixes are easy for me to determine their significations or earlier grammatical functions, and with the exception of \*-h-, \*-t-, -n-, -m-, -r-, and -l-, all other possible infixes are difficult to prove. As for suffixes, *most of them* are proots and only *some* are grammatical suffixes. Both types are often easy for me to recognize, but I encounter a very serious problem in determining *only* the earliest significations of very few of them.

5) For what concerns the *three types of weak roots* (§2.1.7.2 above), in many cases the weak radical is an essential part of the root, esp. in *medial position*, and in some others, it has been added to express a grammatical function. To determine whether a weak radical is part of the biliteral or not, we must apply the same semantic criteria outlined above. By applying the criteria to Sem. [nwr] “light, fire, etc.”, for instance, we will

discover an unexpected proot \*’w-. This proot underlies not only the just cited trilateral but tens of other traditional trilaterals, and some of them have totally different surface structures (see §2.17.1 below). A deep study of weak roots is given below in the following sections and subsections §§2.1.13–2.1.14 below.

### 2.1.13 *Weak & Doubled Roots*

There is a widespread phenomenon in the Semitic lexicon associated with weak roots and doubled roots and on which some traditionally long standing theories have been built. When weak trilaterals have in common two strong radicals {=XZ} they often express identical or similar meanings regardless of the position of the weak radical in the trilateral, whether it is *initial, medial or final*. Thus,

$$WXZ = XWZ = XZW \text{ (W= /w/, /y/, and often /’/)}$$

Such semantic congruence also seems to link such roots, esp. *those with medial or final weak radical*, to doubled roots {=XZZ}. Thus,

$$WXZ = XWZ = XZW = XZZ$$

1) The following are just very few of numerous examples that can be cited:

1a) BHeb. rāqāḵ [rḳḳ] “to spit”, yāraḵ [wrḳ] id., Eth. [wrḳ] id., BAram. [rwḳ] id. (OT, 427), OffAram. [rwḳ] “to spit”, [rḳḳ] (NWSI II, 1064, 1084), CA rayyaḳa “moisten with spittle”, rīḳu “saliva, spittle”. For BHeb. [rḳḳ], CA raḳraḳa, said of the eyes, “shed tears”; ruḳḳu “little flowing water”; raḳḳa-tu “a land that becomes empty of water” = BHeb. [rwḳ] “to empty, be emptied” also “pour itself out, be poured out” (OT, 972).

1b) OAram. [’rr], [’ry], Phoen. [’ry], (NWSI II, 887, 890; Rosenthal, AG, 13), BHeb. ’ārā(h) [’rh, i.e. ’ry] “be naked”, ’ārār [’rr] id., ’ūrā [’wr] id. (OT, 762), CA ’ariya “be naked”, ’āru (r. ’yr], ’urrā [r. ’rr] “disgrace, shame”, Sab. ’wr “unprotected situation” (SD, 23) = CA ’wr “unprotected, i.e. naked” (Koran 33:13), Sab. ’yr “disgrace, shame” (SD, 22), ’rr “devastation” (SD, 20) = BHeb. ’rr “make naked, make bare > lay bare, demolish”; ’ir’ēr “be laid bare, be utterly demolished” (OT, 820) = CA CXII ’i’rawrā, said of a wall, etc., id.

1c) Eth. [wšr] “to saw”, BHeb. [šwr] “a saw” (OT, 699), CA ’ašara [’šr] “to saw”, wašara [wšr] id., šarra [šrr] id., Also, in CA, Aram. [nšr] id., Akk. šaššaru, Phoen. [yšr] id. (MD, 302-303).

1d) BHeb. dākā(’) [dk’] “to break in pieces, beat small, crush”, dūk [dwk], dākā(h) [dky] id., [dkk] obsol. = CA dakka [dkk] “to pound, beat small, crush”, dāka [dwk] “to crush, pound”, Pun. dwk “to shatter”, etc. see §2.1.6.5.1 above.

1e) CA rā’a, rauwa’a [rw’] “to frighten”, wari’a [wr’] “to fear”, yarā’u [yr’] “one who shows fear”, ru’ā’u [r’], pl., “easily frightened persons, mean and low persons”, ra’ā’a-tu “ostrich”, *so-called because it is always fearful* (LA, r’), BHeb. [r’h], [r’] “evil, bad”, [yr’] “to tremble; fear” (OT, 987, 989, 427), Ug. [yr’] “to fear” (UG, 532).

1f) Ug. [yšr] “to form, create” (UG, 532), Assy. ešēru “to form, fashion; image, statue” (King, 1898: 331), BHeb. [yšr] “to form, fashion, make; create (God)”, metaph. “mind, imagination” = BHeb. šūrah [šwr] “form, shape”, Sab. šwr “image” (SD, 146), CA šauwara [r. šwr] “to form, fashion, shape, make a picture” also “create”; mu-šauwiru “creator (God)”; CV ta-šauwara “to figure out, conceive, imagine, portray in the mind”,



šūra-tu fem. “form, picture”, etc.

1g) Akk.-Assyr. kīpu [kwp], kapapu [kpp] “to bind, curve, bow down”, Syr., Mand. kpp id., BHeb. kāpap [kpp], kāpā [kpy] id., Talm., BAram. kph [kpy] “to bow, turn away” (MD, 209; OT, 484-485), Hatra kpp “vaulted room”, kph, Palm., JAram. kph “arch, bent, curve, vaulted room” (NWSI I, 529, 531), CA kafa’a [kf] “to turn away”, kaffa [kff] “to turn, turn around”; CX ’istakaffa “to twist, to coil (of a serpent)”; kiffa-tu “any round object”, wikāfu ~ wukāfu [wkf] in one old dialect, and ’ikāfu ~ ’ukāfu [’kf] in another “saddle” from its resemblance to an arch in shape, kawwafa [kyp ~ kwp] “to turn round, make round or like a circle”.

1h) BHeb. sph [spy] “to scrape off; take away (e.g. *life*)”; Niph. “to perish, be destroyed”, [swp] “to sweep or snatch away; to perish; to destroy”, BAram., Syr. swp “make an end of, perish”, [’sp] “take out of the way, destroy”, CA swf “a disease that takes away life, e.g. *destroy men and animals; death*” as a vb ’asāfa “bring to an end, e.g. life, make perish”.

1i) BHeb. [šwr] “to press, bind up, straiten”, šārar [šrr] “to bind up, press, compress, wrap”; šar, adj., “strait, narrow” (OT, 888, 904, 906-7; Ryder, 1974: 116), [yšr] “be strained, narrow” (OT, 417), CA šarra [šrr] “to bind up, wrap, press, jail, confine, restrain”; CVIII ’ištarra “be very narrow (e.g. hoof)”; muštarru, adj., “very narrow”, [wšr] ~ [’šr] “covenant”, i.e. *one that binds*, OffAram. [šrr] “to press, bind, wrap up”, Akk. šurāru “purse” (NWSI, II, 976) = CA šurra-tu id. CA šry “to gather together, restrain, confine” also “protect (from ‘bind’, ‘wrap’), Sab. šry “to protect” (SD, 145). Numerous other examples illustrating this phenomenon will be seen throughout this research.

It is worth-noting that Semitists consider the examples set forth above as evidence confirming that the weak element in the trilateral is an accretion to a biliteral base of two strong radicals (cf. Hurwitz, 1963: 7-19). On the other hand, some Semitists, though consider the weak radical as an affix, they attempt to associate it with a definable meaning (§2.1.14 below). However, a close study of Semitic roots will prove in a way as clear as sunshine that the weak element is an essential part of the proot, and that it is also found in the underlying forms of most (*if not indeed all*) strong roots.

2) For what concerns a doubled root, this phenomenon raises the question whether *the doubling of the second radical in many (if not all) of such roots is not, from its very inception, associated with a grammatical function, or whether the doubling has been the product of assimilation*. As a matter of fact *assimilation* has been responsible for the creation of so many doubled roots, and this natural linguistic process will be *fully* illustrated and explained in the course of this research.

3) As for weak roots, the phenomenon is evidence that a grammatical affix could appear in any position, and that at a given stage of Hamito-Semitic development, there was a flexible word order of affix-stem combination, so that the affix could appear in any position in the stem without affecting the meaning of the utterance or the syntactic relationships that hold between its elements, since

(a) *the affix had a well-defined meaning or function.*

(b) *meaning and grammatical relationships were expressed by inflectional affixes.*

This is, of course, not a mere hypothesis *at all*, but a fact supported by ample

evidence drawn from both Semitic and Hamitic language divisions. For example, the definite article is a prefix in CA and BHeb., but a suffix in Aramaic; the causative affix /š/ is a prefix in some Semitic languages (Akk., Ug.), but a suffix in Cushitic and Chadic (§2.2 below). However, the previous occurrence of this affix as a suffix in all Semitic languages is not rare (see §2.2.57.1 below). Similarly, the passive affix /n/, which is used as a prefix in Semitic, is used in Cushitic as a prefix in some languages and suffix in some others (see §2.11 below). The affix /t/ is used in Semitic as a prefix forming passive and reflexive stems (see CV, CVI, & CVIII stems in 2.1.7.3 above), while in Cushitic as a suffix (see §2.7 below), and so forth.

4) A natural consequence of the morphological phenomenon just outlined above is that Hamito-Semitic languages do not always agree on the position of the affix in the traditional root, with the result that the surface phonological structure of the triliteral is not always a valid criterion for establishing cognates.

Not only do Hamito-Semitic languages disagree on the position of the affix in the root, but also on the affix itself. One Semitic language may prefer to use an affix /x/, for example, to express a given idea, another may use an affix /z/ (*x & z = any two phonemically different affixes having the same or similar grammatical meaning*) to express the same idea, with the expected result that many real Semitic cognates have hitherto been undetected. Some examples illustrating this phenomenon are: CA [mhy] and Sab. [nhy] are cognates and their difference lies in the *negative element* each uses; CA uses /m-/, while Sab. uses /n-/ (see §2.19.1, n. 1 below). Another type of the same phenomenon is exemplified by Akk. *maḫātu* “to fall” (CA, Sab. *mḫṭ*) = CA *saḫaṭa* id., are both from \*ḫaṭ- (§2.10.9 below), and Akk. *dgl* “mirror” = CA *sgl* id. (§2.1.6.5.9 above). Another sort of difference is seen in CA ṭā‘ā and its Sab. cognate [nṭ‘] where one Semitic language uses an affix to denote a given idea; another expresses the same idea without using an affix (§2.11.75 below). An identical case is Eth. *gal* “have sex with a woman” = BHeb. ṣgl = CA hgl id., where Heb. and CA employed two different causative prefixes (§2.2.34 below).

We have already seen (in §2.1.6.5.10 above) that Heb-Aram. used the prefix [d- + laḫ] “to burn”, while CA used [s- + laḫ]. A third caus. [‘-] is also used with the same stem by CA and Akk (see §2.6.9 below). As we will see in §2.3.13, n. 9 below, Ug. BHeb., etc. use [b + ‘ar] “burn”, whereas CA, Egyp., Chad. use [š + ‘ar] to express the same meaning, and so on. This is indeed a widespread phenomenon in Semitic lexicon, and very numerous examples illustrating it are found throughout this research. Some of them have already been mentioned, e.g. see §2.1.12, n. 2 above, etc.

So far, we have been concerned with combinations of stems and grammatical affixes, paying no attention to processes of word formation like compounding, etc. Compounding and some other processes will be dealt with in a number of subchapters below as in §§2.4 & 2.12-3.17 below. One should remember, however, that we are dealing with a period of Hamito-Semitic historical development in which ‘full words’ beginning slowly in most (but not all) Hamito-Semitic languages to lose their independence and become affixes.

## 2.1.14 *Critical Review of Theories Built on Weak and Doubled Roots*

Before entering into a detailed study of Hamito-Semitic roots, it may be well to comment very briefly on some hypotheses made on weak and doubled trilaterals. Von Soden believes that there is a correlation between some types of weak verbs and certain semantic categories (see Moscati, 1969: §§1630-1636) and calls attention to the following categories:

**2.1.14.1** *Verbs primae w-, y-: a) verbs which describe certain involuntary actions, e.g. Sem. wld “to give birth”; b) the aim or target of a motion, e.g. Eth. wsd “to lead to”.*

### *Comments*

Semitic [wld] is a compound of stem [wal] “offspring” and \*-d-. The first part of the compound is seen in CA waliy “chief, governor, prince”; pl. ’awliyā’u + God = “God’s men”, Egyp. [wr], [wl] “great man, prince, chief” also “eldest son” (EHD I, 170), Sab. [wly-t], coll., “protected persons” (SD, 160), Cush.: Som. wīl, Sid. yil “son, child”, Berb. aw, u- “son”; fem. ult (VPHS, 196, n. 498).

1) It seems to me that Egyp. [wr/wl] combines the meanings of both Sem. [wl-] and [w’l ~ ’wl ~ ww]. The latter Semitic trilateral is seen in Ug. ’awl “premier”, CA ’awwalu “premier, précédant, ancien”: BHeb. mō(’)l, mūl “devant, en face de”, Aram.: Jp. ’awlā “commencement, passé” (DRS I, 12). Such notions belong to two different proots and discussed in depth in §2.17.15 below.

2) To Semitic \*’wl- above ultimately belong [’wl, ’wl] “man, family” as in Akk. awīlu “man, governor, ruler” (AG, 68), CA ’ālu “family, tribe”, ’ā’ila-tu “family” (see below), Heb. ’ēylēy “chiefs of”, Ug. ul “army” (Rabin, 1975: 91, n. 52): see below §§2.17.26, n. 2; 2.17.15 & 2.17, 6, n. 1.

In addition to ’ā’ila-tu above, CA also has ’iyāl, from “family”, only in the sense, *those one feeds and supports* (LA). PHS proot /’a/ in the just mentioned words in (2) is a proot and will be studied in depth in §2.14 below.

3) As for Eth. [wsd], it is from the root in Ug. ysd “to found”; msdt “foundation” (UG, 532), Phoen. ysd “base”; msd “foundations”, JAram. ysd “to found, establish” (NWSI I, 462), BHeb. ysd “to set, place, seat, lay the foundations of anything”, CA ta-wassada “to put or place under, e.g. *a pillow, cushion*” (OT, 405), Sab. ms<sup>3</sup>d (instead of the expected \*ms<sup>1</sup>d?) “base, plinth of statue” (SD, 163), etc. Initial /w-/ is a prefix (see §2.12 below) and the trilateral is based on [sd] as in CA sudda-tu “seat” also “throne”, Egyp. st “seat”. The proot underlying [sd] and [wsd] as well as tens of other surface trilaterals is [-θa-] (see §§2.7.32 & 2.9.18, 2.12.14 below), while /-d/ is a mere suffix from an earlier /-t/ (§2.9.1 below).

The foregoing discussion shows that the signification of Eth. [wsd] is a special Eth. development found in some Eth. languages like Ge. wasada, Tna. wäsädä, and Amh. wässäda.

**2.1.14.2** *Verbs mediae geminatae: especially verbs which connote a number of*

individual actions, e.g. Akk. šll, Syr. bzz “to plunder”, CA ‘dd “to count”, etc.

### Comments I

Verbs of this type denote repeated actions only in reduplication: CA ʔaʔʔa “to scissor, cut” > ʔaʔʔaʔa, maʔʔa “to suck” > maʔʔaʔa, daʔʔa “to knock” > daʔʔaʔa, ʔarra “to scatter” > ʔarʔara, ‘adda “to count” > ‘ad‘ada, and so forth. Another point to be clarified before attempting to explain the phenomenon is that reduplication is not restricted to doubled roots, and that in some cases a reduplicative verb may have nothing to do with the meaning expressed by the doubled verb, e.g. CA salla (= Akk. šll “to plunder” above): salsal- and bzz “to blackmail” (= Syr. bzz above): bazbaz-.

According to Farāhīdi (Al ‘ayn VII, 81-82) ʔarra, for example, “to creak”, but if the action is repeated again and again, then one should say ʔarʔara. Similarly, ya‘addu “bites”, while ya‘duddu “bites repeatedly, i.e. a lot” (LA). Ibin Jinni (Khaṣā’iṣ II, 153ff) distinguishes two types of reduplication as follows:

1) *Full reduplication*, a process whereby the entire word is repeated or copied to express ‘repeated actions’ as in za‘za‘a-tu and ʔalʔala-tu, etc. This type of reduplication expresses many repeated actions that continue for some time. For example, za‘za‘a, cited by Ibin Jinni, expresses “to shake (e.g. a tree) in order to uproot it”, said of the wind, “to shake the branches of tree”. The action here is not limited to ‘one shake’ that takes place at a definite point of time. In fact, it may take some time to uproot a tree by keeping on shaking it. The other example also expresses the same sort of ‘repeated’, ‘frequentative’, or ‘multiple’ action or event: ʔalʔala “to move swiftly to and fro, shake and move repeatedly”, BHeb. ʔilʔal “to move swiftly to and fro” (OT, 928). Some other examples of full reduplication are Egyp. hphp “to run” (hp “to walk, to move”: cf. EHD I, 446), ndnd “take counsel” (nd “ask”), snsn “fraternize” (sn “brother”), ftft “crush” (simplex unknown: cf. EG, §274) = CA fatfata “tear or break into pieces” (simplex fatta id.), Housa ciye ciye “constant eating” (ciye “eat”), tambaye tambaye “repeated questioning” (tambaya “ask”), etc.

I have noticed that in SL a reduplicative verb usually requires a plural object, e.g. hadd l ʔayt “he knocked, or pulled, down the wall”, but hadhad l ʔiṭān “he knocked, or pulled, down repeatedly the walls”: comp. Egyp. had “to strike, to trample down”; hadhad “to batter down, to beat small, to crush” (EHD I, 452). See n. 6 below for a similar illustration from CA.

Adjectives, too, like verbs and nouns, can be reduplicated as in Housa maza maza “very fast”, BHeb. Is. 18,8 ʔaw ʔaw ʔaw ʔaw “a nation most mighty” Gesenius (OT, 917). Similarly, in most modern Arabic dialects (Leb., Egyp., etc.), the repetition of any adjective (e.g. ʔawi ʔawi, lit. “strong strong or mighty mighty”) denotes “an intensive meaning, i.e. much strong”<sup>51</sup>. Such reduplicative forms are not infrequent in CA.

2) *Partial reduplication*, a process whereby the last two radicals of a triliteral are repeated and the resultant form expresses ‘an intensive meaning’ like damakmaku, ‘arakraku, ‘aʔaʔaʔabu, etc. Similar reduplicative forms in other Semitic languages and in

<sup>51</sup> Reduplicated adjectives may also express *diminutiveness* as in Housa fari fari “whitish” (farri “white”), etc. *Diminutiveness* has developed from *intensiveness*, and there are many examples from CA supporting this fact.

Egyp. are BHeb. *yəraḳraḳ* “greenish”, *ʾāsafsūf* “common people”, Syr. *šəlamləmā* “complete”, Syr. *šprpr*, BAram. *šəparəpārā* “the dawn, aurora”, Eth. *ḥamalmīl* “greenish”, Tig. *hatamtam* “babbling” = CA *tamtama* id. (Gray, 1971: §149; Moscati, 1969: §12.13: c), Egyp. *ngngn* “to break into pieces, destroy” (EHD I, 398), *ḥḏndn* “be vexed” (EHD I, 524), *swtw* “walk, promenade”, *ḥ’g’g* “exult” from *ḥ’g* “be pleasant” (EG, §274). I believe that this type of reduplication came into existence long after the adoption of a third radical as part of the root, and that it was formed on the analogy of ‘full reduplication’. It signals an increase in size or intensity. For example, BHeb. *səḥarḥar* “to move about rapidly”, e.g. *of the heart*, i.e. “to palpitate very strongly”: *sāḥar* “go about” (OT, 718-719). Another example is CA *ʾaramaramu*, said of an army, “very numerous” is much more intensive than *ʾārimu*, also said of the army, id.: cf. *ʾarama* “to heap”; *ʾarama-tu* “a heap”, Sab. *ʾrm* “boundary cairn” (SD, 19), BHeb. *ʾrm* “be heaped up”, Syr. *ʾrm* “to heap up” (OT, 818), etc. all are from a proot \*ʾar- “to rise” (§§2.8.4-2.8.6, etc. below).

3) The deep semantic notion that lies beneath reduplication is “plenty (*much/many*) + meaning of the root. Thus, a reduplicated verb is a ‘plural verb’, designating a number of repeated actions. This may rightly suggest that all reduplicative verbs are originally derived from reduplicative or plural nouns, and that the origin of reduplication has to be sought in the type of ‘plural nouns’ formed by reduplication and not in the verb as a part of speech<sup>52</sup>. CA has preserved some reduplicated collective nouns like *kaḥkaḥu* coll. “stones”, *dindinu* “roots of trees”, and so many others. A good example of this type is *sawāʾu* “self, same” > pl. *sawāsiwa-tu* ~ *sawāsiya-tu* or *sawāsi*.

In some Cushitic languages like Saho, a common pattern of forming the plural is by repeating the last radical as in *laḥa* “bone”, pl. *lafof*, and *gaba* “hand”, pl. *gabob* (Welmers, 1973: 224). Their Semitic cognates are respectively CA *laḥaʾa* “take the flesh off the bone” and *ḡubba-tu* fem. “part of a horse’s leg”, pl. *ḡubabu*. This type of plural is not infrequent in CA and perh. the one found in Akk., but with loss of the vowel of the second syllable as in *abu* “father”, pl. *abbū*; *iṣu* “tree”, pl. *iṣṣū*. For further information on this particular type of reduplication, see §2.3.38, n. 2 below.

Some other examples of complete or partial reduplication are: Cush.: Som. *ʾad* “white”, pl. *ʾadʾad*; *der* “tall”, pl. *derder*; Kafa *bako* “hand”, pl. *bakiko*; Chad.: Housa *yasa* “finger”, pl. *yasosi*; Sem.: ESA *ʾl* “god”, pl. *ʾlʾl-t*, etc. For additional examples from Sem. and Egyp., see O’Leary, 1969: §122: c. and Moscati, 1969: §§12.57 & 12.58.

4) In some rare cases, we find that CA has lost the doubled root, but retained its reduplicated form<sup>53</sup>. For example, CA has *maymaya* “to mix to excess”, more common as a subst. as in Poet.:

*mā minka ḥaltu* (ʾa)l *ḥuluḳi* (ʾa)l *muṣmayi* (Al ʾAyn IV, 352).

Ug. [mymy] “to mix” (UG, 534).

5) A strange type of reduplication involves repeating the first radical as follows: F&L

<sup>52</sup> There is also some scanty evidence suggesting that reduplication may be used to express *dual* or *pair of*.

<sup>53</sup> A similar example is Egyp. *shsh* “to have pleasure” (EHD II, 688) = SL *saḥsaḥ* “to be extremely pleased”, where both have lost the doubled root. The quadrilateral seems to be based on [ḥayy] “good, pleasing”: see §2.19.1, esp. n. 1 below.

> F&FL. This type of reduplication is rare in CA, but found in other Semitic languages and common in modern dialects of Arabic as *fariḥ* “be happy” > *farfaḥ* “be extremely happy”, *farak* “to rub with the hand” > *farfak*, *zarab* “to leak water” > *zarzab* “leak water to excess” = BHeb. *zarzīp* “a pouring rain”, Aram.: Jp. *zarzīpā* “drop of liquid” (see §2.3.34, n. b below).

A surface example from CA may be *ḡarḡafa* “to shudder or shiver from cold”; *ḡarḡafu* “cold water”. LA (r. *ḡrḡf*) strangely derived it from [rḡf], and assumed that /ḡ/ was repeated initially. The verb *raḡafa* is said to signify “to shudder or quiver from cold”. I believe, however, that those who first coined [ḡrḡf] joined two roots [ḡr] “cold” (CA, Akk., Ug., Heb. *ḡr* id.) and [ḡf] “shudder (from cold)” (CA *ḡaffa* id., the real Semitic cognate of Egyp. *ḡbb* “cold”), and later a proot [ḡ-] was added initially (see §3.17.83 below).

### Comments II

The addition of [r-] to [ḡf] and the emergence of a new trilateral [rḡf] are coupled with the presence of many trilaterals with prefixed /r-/ (see §2.15 below), and with the fact that many of the prefixes we are dealing with and forming the foundation on which Semitic trilateral system rests, were identified by old Arab scholars as *extra letters* in some of their occurrences. Furthermore, we have already seen and will also see below that old Arab scholars defined the meaning of many trilateral verbs whose initial radical is an old causative prefix, either /d-/, /s-/, or /h-/, as *expressing a causative meaning*. In many other cases, they located exactly a radical of a trilateral and recognized it as *an extra letter*. One may wonder why such scholars did not tolerate seeing any root with less than three radicals in the language to such an extent that they modified all biliteral nouns found in CA (and its sister languages) by adding a semivowel to each biliteral to make it fit the system they imposed on the language, such as [bny] “son”, but in CA, Akk. *binu*, Ugr. *Phoen.*, Sab. *bn*, [’bw] “father”, but in CA, Akk. *’abu*, Ug., Sab. *’b*, etc. The reason is clear and well-known. Their marvelous and accurate work on CA phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, semantics, and many other linguistic phenomena in the language was never done for the sake of the language, but rather to make the whole language in harmony with *the Koran*. I will treat this particular topic in depth in §3.24 below.

Returning to prefixed /r-/, the above-given information suggests that [r-], like /s-/, h-/, /n-/, /m-/, /t-/, /’-/, etc. had continued to be used as a prefix in all stages of the language down to the 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup> c. A.D.

6) The second radical can also be repeated in Heb. and perh. in Egyp. (§2.11.22, n. a below), and the result is *doubled* or *geminat* stems, which are ultimately the same as Akk. and CA CII intensive stems (§2.1.7.3 above). Gardiner (EG, §274), however, tries unsuccessfully to differentiate here between *germination* and *reduplication*, and wrongly insists that Heb. and Egyp. forms are reduplicative forms.

Apart from the obvious semantic difference between CI, *the ground stem*, e.g. CA *ḡatala* “to kill”, and *its intensive* CII, e.g. CA *ḡattala*, there is still *a major syntactic difference one should keep in mind*. The *object* of CII verbs must be pl., hence *ḡatala Ali ’al raḡula* “Ali killed the man”, but *ḡattala Ali ’al riḡāla* “Ali killed the men (never

\*the man)".

**2.1.14.3** *Verbs mediae -y-* describe a physiological function as in Semitic \*šyn “to urinate” or connote a definite outcome or result as in Akk., Arabic, Eth. [hyr] “to elect”.

### Comments III

As has been mentioned earlier and on a number of occasions, the weak radical is often an essential part of the proot. We also find a weak radical in the underlying structures of the overwhelming majority of strong triliterals, i.e. *those whose surface structure contains three strong radicals and none of the weak /w/ or /y/*. To determine with certainty whether a weak radical is a part of the proot or not, one has to follow the *semantic test* as outline in §2.1.12, n. 1a above. Frankly, the more you follow it strictly and scientifically, the less strong triliterals you find not only in Semitic but also in Hamitic.

For Semitic \*šyn, the correct form is [θy-n], as in Ug. [θyn], CA ma-θā-na-tu, etc., see §2.10.19 below. As for Semitic \*h<sub>2</sub>yr, it is from a compound of [hay-] “good” plus the comparative suffix -r- (§2.19, esp. n. 1 below).

## 2.2 PHS CAUSATIVE /š-/

The morpheme /š-/ is used in HS as a causative prefix as in Egyp. s-, Akk., Ug., OSA (with the exception of Sab.) š-: cf. Egyp. rm “to weep” > srm “cause to weep”, mh “to forget” > smh “make to forget”, Akk. ikbus “to tread” > šukbusu “cause to tread upon”. In Berber the causative \*š- appears as a prefix as in Shil. *ail* “to flee” > *sail* “cause to flee”, Kab. *ekhem* “to enter” > *sekhem* “cause to enter”, Libyan *ers* “descend” > *sers* “bring down”. It also found as a suffix in Chadic and Cushitic as in Housa *če* “eat” > *čise* “feed”, Som. *gaad* “to arrive, reach” > *gaadsi* “make reach”, Ga. *choma* “fat” > *chomsa* “fatten”, Bed. *gay* “be new” > *segay* “renew”, Kafa *qay* “be complete” > *qayis* “finish” (O’Leary, 1969: 218ff; Moscati, 1969: §§16.10-16.11; Barton, 1934: 22).

The prefix \*š- is also used to form nouns and adjectives as in Akk., Assyr. *šalpūtu* “destruction” (*lapātu* “to destroy”), *šurbū* “great” (*rabū* “be great”), *šūpū* “brilliant, glorious” (*apū* “to shine forth”). Numerous examples of such formations are found in CA, but with \*š- being a part of the root. Obvious examples are *samlaḡu* “sweet milk” < *malaḡa* “to suck the udder or breast, i.e. *milk*”, *saḥlabu* “a kind of drink made from milk” < *ḥalību* “milk”; *ḥalaba* “to milk”, *saḥbalu* “big- or huge-bellied” < *ḥbl* “be pregnant”, etc.

It should be remembered, however, that the corresponding causative prefix in CA, Eth., and Aram. dialects is /ʾ-/ as in CA *ʾalima* “to know, learn” > *ʾaʾlama* “cause one to know, to inform, make learn” (§2.3). In Moab., BHeb., OAram., Sab., Tham., Lih. (also in CA), the corresponding causative prefix is /h-/ as in Sab. *mlk* “become king” > *hmlk* “cause to become king” (§2.4 below).

The causative morpheme /š-/ is found in CA as a part of the root and appears as a prefix (e.g. *salkā* “to throw prostrate” = *ʾa-lkā* “to throw”), but sometimes as a suffix. It is important to stress, however, that, though the prefix has been permanently attached to the root in CA, yet *the meaning expressed by the root is often causative* (see, for example, §2.2.1, §2.2.4, n. a, etc. below), and that in many cases *this causative prefix was identified by old Arab scholars as an extra letter* and a variant form of /ʾ-/. There is evidence that /š/ also occurred as a suffix in Egyp. as, for example, *nd* “little, something small” > *nds* “to be little, become small” (EHD I, 411, 413).

It may be important to note that among other causative prefixes found in Hamito-Semitic languages is a suffixed vowel \*-i as in Som. *dil* “kill” > *dil-i* “cause to kill”, in Nama *mā* “to stand” > *mā-i* “cause to stand” (sometimes the /s/ is retained as in *ai* “to suck” > *ai-si* “cause to suck”), in Fula *anda* “know” > *andad-i-na* “cause to know”. Barton (1934: 22) attributed this causative vowel to the influence of Sudanese and Bushman languages. Concerning Barton’s hypothesis, I admit that Hamitosemitists are excellent at attributing any feature or any word they can neither explain nor comprehend to a foreign origin or to unknown source. The logical question rises here, *do they know that caus. /ʾ-/ is as common in the entire Hamito-Semitic language divisions as /š-/?* (see his view and other Semitists’ view on /ʾ-/ in §2.3 below).



The fact is that as caus. /š/ appears as a prefix in some Hamito-Semitic languages and a suffix in some others, caus. /ʔ/ or /y/ (§2.6 below), too, could also appear as both a suffix and prefix in different Hamito-Semitic languages. For a possible origin of Hamito-Semitic caus. \*š-, also see §2.3 below.

The following examples are intended to show that causative /š/ has partly or wholly become an inseparable part of the root in the entire Hamito-Semitic languages.

**2.2.1** CA *saḡama* “to grieve, harm” (Al ‘Ayn IV, 380) = CIV ‘*aḡamma* caus. of *ḡamma* “to distress, make suffer, grieve”: *ḡammu* “distress, sorrow, grief”: *ḡumma-tu* “distress, sorrow, darkness”: *ḡumma*, pass., “be hidden, to obscure, be distressed”; *ḡamama* “to cover; shut up”; *ḡamḡama* “to cover”; *ḡamāmu* [ḡm] (~ *ḡaymu* [ḡym]) “clouds”; BAram. ‘m’m “be obscured”; *Ithp.* “grow dark, be obscured, *as the eyes*”; ‘am’ēm “to obscure, grow dark”, BHeb. ‘āmam “to shut up, close”; *Hoph.* “be obscured, become dim” (OT, 796), Syr., Mand. ‘um “to obscure, darken” (MD, 343)<sup>54</sup>.

**2.2.2** BHeb. šā’ap “to breathe hard, to pant, to pant after, to blow” (OT, 1024) is based on BHeb. ‘ap “nose” < \*’anpu: cf. ‘ānap “to breathe hard from the nostrils, to breathe”.

**2.2.3** CA *saiyaba* “to desert, abandon”, *as one deserts his home, his land, his cattle*. The central idea here is ‘*the expected ruined state*’ of whatever being deserted or left behind, hence, *sā’ibu* “deserted, abandoned”, which gives the impression of *negligence, sadness, destruction*: < *yabābu* “deserted or abandoned land, ruin, destruction, being in a ruined state”, Egyp. *yb* “to stop, cease” (EHD II, 38). The same biliteral is seen with prefixed \*t- in §2.7.23 below.

**2.2.4** Syr. *šgar* “to burn, kindle, heat”, Mand. *šgr* “to burn, kindle, flame up, heat” (MD, 448), CA *saḡara* “to burn” as in the Koran: (في النار يسجرون), *in the fire they will be burned* (40: 72). All are from a stem \*gar- “to burn; heat, hot, sun” as in Akk. *giro*, *girru* “fire, deity of fire”, *gurāru* “hot ash” ~ *kirāru* id., Chad.: Sura *kuur*, Angas *kur* “ash”, Ndm *gurē* “coal” (HSED, n. 985). The stem is also seen in a good number of trilaterals. A list of them will be given in §2.4.16.

a) It is worth-mentioning that the real meaning of CA [sḡr] is “cause to burn”, i.e. = CIV ‘aḡmā of [ḡm] or CIV ‘awḡada of [wḡd]: cf. ŠHH II, 677; LA, but old Arab scholars never recognized /s-/ as a causative prefix; it was only identified in some

<sup>54</sup> Examples of trilaterals based on stem [ḡam] are:

a) CA [ḡmr] “to flood; inundate” also “to heap up, overwhelm, submerge”, BHeb. ‘mr “to heap together, to overwhelm, to submerge” (OT, 798), JAram. ‘mr “to pack” (NWSI II, 873),

b) CA [ḡmḏ] “to close one’s eyes” and “be obscured”, JAram. ‘mṣ “to close (the eyes)” (NWSI II, 872),

c) CA ḡmz “to wink”, ḡamsa “plunge, or dip, into water”; ḡammāsa-tu “a bird that plunges into water” (LA), [ḡmt] “to cover, to plunge”, [ḡmḏ] “to cover”; ḡimdu “sheath”, ḡamaṣa, said of the eye, “to discharge matter”, like [rmṣ] and [‘mṣ], with slightly different shades of meaning, etc.

trilaterals as *an extra letter*.

**2.2.5** Moab. šlk “to assault; assailant” (NWSI II, 1144), BHeb. šlk “to cast, to throw; cast down, overthrow” also “sea-fowl” (OT, 1062-1063), CA salaka “to thrust with a lance, to spear”; sulkā “straight forward thrust” as in the PIP of Imri’ Al Qais:

«naṭ’anuhum *sulkā* wa mahlūḡatan...» (LA).

In addition, sulaku “young of sand-grouse”, sulkūtu “a kind of bird”, Chad.: Kera sulku “guinea fowl”, Kwan sulkō id. (HSED, n. 2291). The trilateral seems to be based on a stem lak-: see §2.1.10 above.

**2.2.6** Syr. šḥm “be black”, Mand. šhm “be hot; red-hot, to redden” (MD, 451), CA saḥama “to become/be black”; ’aḥamu “black color”, fem. saḥmā’u as in the PIP of Antarah:

«*saḥmā’u* talma’u dāta ḥaddin lahḏami».

PHS stem \*ḥam- as in CA ḥamma “to burn, heat”, hence ’aḥammu “black”; ḥumyā “anger”; ’iḥmaumā “become black”, Akk. emēmu “be hot”, BHeb. חָרַם “black” (OT, 300), also ḥāmam “be or become warm”; ḥām “warm, hot”, ḥēmah “heat, poison, anger, wrath” (OT, 323-324), CA ḥmy “heat, hot, to heat, to warm”; Ug. ḥm “heat, hot” (UG, 533), Egyp. ḥm “to be hot, to be dry, to burn”; ḥm-t “fire, heat” (EHD, 547). As in Egyp., the voiceless fricative /h-/ is also seen in other HS language divisions, including Semitic (see §2.2.38 below), and it seems to be one of primeval proots for “sun, fire”.

PHS stem [ḥam] is a compound consisting of a proot [ḥaW-] “sun” and \*-m. A very lengthy discussion will be given to [ḥaW-] and to large numbers of roots derived from it in §2.13.24 below.

**2.2.7** CA sadala “let down (curtain, etc.), let hang down (hair, etc.), to lower”, is based on [dal] as in CA dalla “to hang down loosely, lower, dangle”, BHeb. dli “to hang down” also dālā “to hang down, let hang down”, Eth. dlw “to hang down”, CA dālā id. (OT, 225), Jib. edlel “let hanging” (DRS IV, 256).

It should be made clear that the signification ‘lower’ means here only “one end of a thing is fixed or attached to s.t. while the other end is lowered or hanging down, and the direction is always from *a higher to lower place*”.

a) To stem [dal-] certainly belongs Akk. dalū “schopfeimer” , Chad.: Dor. dāli “wassertopf”, Log. dōli id. (Müller, 1975: 66, n. 27), Talm., Syr., Jp, Mand. dwl, by metathesis, “pail, bucket”, CA dalwu “pail with a handle tied to a rope and used for drawing water from a well”, BHeb. dly “bucket, any vessel for drawing water” (NWSI I, 249).

b) Akk. dalā, Heb. dālā, Syr., Jp., Mand. dālā “to draw water from a well” (DRS IV, 262) > this signification may extend to ‘lift up a pail full of water from the well’ > ‘lift up’. Hence, in NWS dly “to lift up” (NWSI I, 249). Their CA cognate is in I below.

c) Based on [dal] are Syr. etdandal “laisser pendre”, Soq. ndldl “se balancer”, CA: Or. tadandal “pendiller” (DRS IV, 280) < CA tadaldala “to hang down, let down” = SL tadandal, more common *ddandal* (dropping the vowel of the first syllable causes assimilation to take place) “make oneself hang down”.

d) Caus. h- can be added to [dal-], creating a new trilateral as in CA haddala<sup>55</sup> “to hang down loosely, dangle, droop”, Mand. hadlia “things that dangle” (MD, 116). For this caus., see §2.4 below.

e) Ge. dälle “buttocks, hips”, Amh. dalle id., Chad.: Margi ta-dal, Kilba ndəl “buttocks” (HSED, n. 636). Such words are derivatives of ‘*hanging*’.

f) Akk. adudillu “a kind of grasshopper”, CA duldulu “a kind of hedgehog”.

g) Sem. dlt “door”, from *hanging and swinging* (see §2.3.5 below), etc.

A similar meaning is expressed by [tly] as in OffAram., JAram. tly “to hang, be held in suspense” (NWSI II, 1215), BAram., Syr. tly “to hang up, to suspend”, BHeb. tālā id. (OT, 1106).

**2.2.8** BHeb. šw’ “evil, wicked(ness)” (OT, 1037), Sab. s’w’ “bad, wicked” (SD, 129), CA sū’u “evil, bad, mischief, harm”; sā’a “be bad, evil, wicked”; CIV ’asā’a “to offend, displease”; ’isā’a-tu “offence, sin”: PHS stem \*’aw- preserved intact in CA CX ’ista’ā: CI ’awā “be offended, displeased”.

a) Like CA, Egyp. preserved both the proot and its augmented trilateral: ’w “sin, evil, wrong disgrace, offence, ill-luck, wickedness” (EHD I, 31) > sw “être mauvais” (VPHS, 136, n. 277).

b) In BHeb. šw’ also expresses “make a noise, be laid waste, destroy”, CA sū’u “destruction” < CA ’uwwa-tu “calamity; shout”; ’awwā “make a noise expressing sorrow or pain, shout at animals” also “to groan, moan” = [’wh] in ta’auwaha id., *from pain, suffering, sorrow* = Egyp. ’w “sorrow, pain, ruin”; ’wí “be violent, wicked”; ’wyw “jackal” (EHD I, 3-4) = CA bin-’awā, a compound of bin “son of” (Akk., CA binu id.) and ’āwā “jackal” ~ wāwī “jackal” = BHeb. ’iy, pl. ’iyyīm “jackal” also “a howling, wailing cry”, orig. “the howler, wailer” > jackal (OT, 40), Cush.: Oromo iyya “wild cat”, Chad.: Warji iyena “dog” (HSED, n. 119). For the ultimate proot underlying stem [’aw], see §3.14.4 below.

**2.2.9** OAram. šḥt “criminal”; šḥth “extermination” (AG. 7), Phoen., OffAram. šḥt “to destroy” (NWSI, II, 1122), CA saḥata “to destroy, eradicate, kill”, BHeb. šḥt “to destroy, ruin, lay in ruins”, in BAram. “to destroy, corrupt” (OT, 1047), Sab. s’ḥt “to rout, defeat” (SD, 125): PHS stem \*ḥat- as in CA ḥatta “to perish, eradicate”, DAram. ḥtt “terror”. The proot is also seen with prefixed n- (§2.11.7 below).

CA saḥata also expresses “to scratch off” < CA ḥatta “to scratch, scrape off, rub off”, BHeb. ni-ḥat “be broken in pieces” (OT, 357).

**2.2.10** Akk. šahāku, Mand., Aram., Syr. šḥk “to crush, break up” (MD, 451), CA saḥaḥa “to crush, pound, pulverize”, OffAram. šḥk ~ shḥk “to rub” (NWSI, II, 1121), BHeb. šāḥaḥ “to rub or beat in pieces, to pound fine” (OT, 1046): PHS stem \*ḥaḥ- as in CA ḥaḥḥa “to overcome; carve”; CVIII ’iḥtaḥḥa “to kill”; ḥāḥa-tu “catastrophe”, BHeb. ḥāḥāh, ḥāḥaḥ “to cut in” (OT, 339), Egyp. s-ḥk “to hack in pieces” (EHD II, 684). The stem is also seen in CA [mḥk] (§2.10.51 below).

<sup>55</sup> The verb includes two causatives: /ha-/ and /-dd-/, i.e. *doubling the medial radical*.

**2.2.11** Assy. šahāṭu “to tear off” (King, 1898: 389), Ug. šḥṭ “to slaughter” (UG, 535), BHeb. šāḥaṭ “to slaughter, kill, slay” (OT, 1045), Pun. šḥṭ “knife” (NWSI, II, 1120-21), CA saḥaṭa (\*saḥaṭa) “to slaughter rapidly” (SL šaḥat “to slaughter”), Ge. sāḥaṭā “to treat with violence, injure”, Syr. šaḥḥeṭ “to wound” (HED, 138-139), SA: Soq. šḥaṭ, Meh. seḥāṭ “to slaughter”: PHS stem \*ḥaṭ- as in CA ḥaṭṭa “to cut (with a sword) in two”, Nab. ḥṭṭ “be destroyed, pulled out” (NWSI I, 363), Egyp. ḥtḥt, with reduplication, “to destroy, break, cut into pieces” (EHD I, 567).

**2.2.12** Akk. šakāpu, Aram., Syr., Mand. škb “to lie down” (MD, 465), Phoen. škb “to lie down, repose” (PG, 149), Ug. škb “to lie down, recline, repose” (UG, 535), BHeb. šākab, Eth. sakaba, BAram. škb “to lie down” (OT, 1052). The corresponding cognate in CA is kabā “to sleep for a brief period, nap” also “to fall” (also kabba “to fall (prone)”) as in the PIP of Antarah:

«fataraktu sayyidahum li’auwali ṭa’natin ya-*kbū* ṣarī’an...» (JAA, p. 372, line 97).

An interesting derivative is CA kaba-t, said when the fire “fades away”, i.e. *be about to extinguish*, with an underlying meaning, *to become sleepy, recline* = OAram. kbh “to extinguish” (AG, 11), in BHeb. “to quench, put out (light, fire)” (OT, 444-445; Ryder, 1974: 99).

But when a fire is “put out, extinguished”, one may use ḥaba-t (Koran 17: 97) or bāḥa-t (-t referring to fire as subj.). A phonemically similar compound expressing an opposite meaning is seen in Egy. baḥ “to burn, be hot”, Chad.: Gabin ḥeḥe, Boka ḥweḥwe, Hwona ḥiḥat “hot”, Migama ḥiyyu “to roast” (HSED, n. 189). The Hamitic words are etymologically different from those of CA. Moreover, CA two roots are not variants of one single root; they express two unrelated meanings.

Egyp. and Chad. [bh] is definitely a compound of proot \*bW- (see §§2.13.20-2.13.26, etc. below) and proot [-hW-] “fire” (see §2.2.6 above & §2.2.38 below). It is possible that CA bāḥa- t [bhW ~ bhy] is a vary ancient compound of proot [b-] “no, not” and \*ḥaW- “fire”. For neg. b-, see §2.21.5 below.

**2.2.13** Akk., Assy. šakānu “to establish, place, set, fix”; maškanu “place, cite” (King, 1898: 389-390), CA sakana “to dwell, live”; maskanu “dwelling place, residence”, Ug. škn “to dwell”; mškn “dwelling” (UG, 532), Phoen., JAram. škn “to dwell, reside”, BHeb. šākan id. (PG, 149, NWSI, II, 1134), Syr., Mand. škn id. (MD, 466), Chad.: Jimbin šinkə “to sit”, Boghom sāgən “to rest” (= CA sakana “become quiet”), Cush.: Iraqw sukunun- “squat” (HSED, n. 2240).

1) The Sem. trilateral seems to have developed from either stem:

1a) \*kaW-n “to be, to establish” as in Assy. kānu “to establish, found, fix, set” (King, op.cit: 353), CA kāna “to be”, Phoen. k(w)n “to be”, Mand. kun “to be, establish”, JAram., Syr., Eth., BHeb. kwn “to be” (MD, 207).

1b) \*kiW-n as in CA kinnu “home”, BHeb. kēn “base, stand, pedestal” (OT, 475), perh. Mand. kina “chamber, container, storeroom” (MD, 213). Both forms are clearly from a proot \*kaW-: see §§2.2.57.3 & 2.2.51.4 below.

2) Assy. seems to have some derivatives of [škn] whose CA cognates are derivative

of [kwn] “to be” above as Assy. *Perm.* *aškin* “situated, placed” = CA *kā’in* “situated, placed, located”, Assy. *šikittu* (\**šikintu*) “creature; being” = CA *kā’in* id., etc. see §2.2.57.3 below.

**2.2.14** Ug. *škr* “to hire” (UG, 533), Phoen. *škr* “to hire” (PG, 150), BHeb., Palm. *škr* “to hire”, OffAram. *škr* “salary” (NWSI, II, 1135). We also find in BHeb. [*skr*] “to hire” (OT, 723): PHS stem \**kar-* as in CA *’akrā* “to hire”, caus. of *karā* “to rent, hire”, BHeb. *karah* “to buy, trade”, Pun. *kry* “to buy” (see §2.3.4 below). For OffAram. *škr*’ above: cf. CA *kirā’u* “wage, salary”.

**2.2.15** Akk., Assy. *šamāru* “to keep, preserve”, Targ. *smr* “to take heed”, Mand. *smr* “to observe, heed, watch over” (MD, 333; King, 1898: 392), OAram. *šmr* “to take heed” (Rosenthal, AG, 14), Phoen. *šmr* “to watch, guard” (PG, 151), Pun., OffAram. *šmr* “to guard” (NWSI, II, 1166-67), BHeb. *šamar* “to watch, guard, observe, keep” (OT, 1072), CA *samara* “keep awake, vigil, keep watch” < \**mar-* “to see, watch” as in Eyp. *mr* “to see” (EHD I, 313), CA *mara’a* id. The root is also seen with casus. /’-/ in all Semitic (see §2.3.7 below). For its ultimate origin, see §2.10.11 below.

**2.2.16** Akk. *šapāru* “to send” (AG, 103), NWS *špr* id. (NWSI, II, 1184), CA *sāfara* “to travel, go (away)”, orig. “to send”: cf. *safīru* “ambassador, mediator”, Tham. *msfr* “traveler” (Branden, 1950: 515) = CA *musāfīru* id.: PHS stem \**par-* “to go out, depart” as in Eyp. *pr* id. (EHD I, 240), BHeb. *pārar* “to run, be born swiftly” (OT, 870), CA *farra* “to flee”, Cush.: Saho *far*, Hadiya *fir* “go out” (HSED, 419). The same stem is seen with various extensions in §§ 2.3.13, n. 1 & 2.11.72 below.

**2.2.17** Amorite *špr* “be shining, fair”, OAram., Palm., Hatra. *špr* “beautiful”, Syr. *šepar* “be beautiful, pleasing”; *šappīr* “beautifully”, Mand. *šapir* “beautiful, pleasing, lovely” (NWSI, II, 1184-85; Shehadeh, 1968: 48), BHeb. *šāpar* “be beautiful, fair”; *šeper* “brightness, i.e. *beauty, pleasantness*”, BAram. *špr* id., with prep. /’/ “be pleasant” (OT, 1083), CA *safara* “to remove the veil (woman)”, i.e. *show one’s beauty*; *’asfara*, caus., “to shine (morning, face, etc.)” as in the PIP of Labīd:

«*ḥattā ’iḏā ’inḥasara (’a)ḏ ḏalāmu wa ’asfar-at...*» (DL, 172, L. 5).

PHS stem \**par-* “to uncover, make visible, see, show” as in Eyp. *pr* “to see, to shine”, with the negative *nt* “not”: *nt pr* “unseen, invisible” (EHD I, 243, 340), CA *farā* “to look at s.t. with perplexity”; *farra*, “cause to see”, i.e. *show*, and this is actually the meaning of *safara* lit. “to remove the veil as to cause others to see the face”, Chad.: Gisiga *pir*, pur “to look, watch”, Bolewa *par-*, Tangale *pari* “to look for, find”, Cush.: Agaw \**par* “open the eyes” (HSED, n. 1954).

The biliteral \**par-* is also seen with prefixed negative /’-/ in Akk., etc., see §2.3.13 below.

**2.2.18** Akk. *šaṭāru* “to write”, JAram., Palm. *šṭr* “to inscribe, write” (NWSI, II, 1123-25), Sab. *s’ṭr* “to inscribe, write” (SD, 129), CA *saṭara* “to incise, write”; *saṭru* “line, row”, BHeb. *šṭr* “writer, scribe”, BAram. *šṭr* “side” (OT, 1048): PHS stem \**ṭar-* as in CA

ṭarra “to cut”.

**2.2.19** BHeb. šā’an “be quiet, to rest”; *Pil.* “be quiet, tranquil, to live in quiet” ~ šā’an “to rest or lean upon anything, for repose and quiet”, in Syr. “repose, quiet” (OT, 1024). The trilateral may have developed from [ʾn] as in CA ta’annā “take one’s time”. The proot is also seen in CA ’āna “to rest”, with caus. /ʾa-/ becoming part of the root, ’awnu “tranquility; meekness; living in tranquility and at ease” as in Poet.: «wa safarun kāna ḡalīla (ʾa)l ’awni» (LA).

**2.2.20** CA sabba “to cut”, BAram. šbb “to break”, BHeb. šəbābīm pl. “fragments” (OT, 1026), Egyp. s-sb “to cut, destroy” (EHD II, 696), Cush.: Bil., Kwara, Dembea sab “to pierce, stab”, Xamir sib, Damot siāb id., Kemant sāb id. (HSED, n. 2230): CA ta-’abbā “to cleave”, etc. see §§2.8.17 & 2.8.18 below. One may note that Hamitic languages have attached the suffix permanently to the root.

a) A derivative of stem [sab-] is Akk. šibbu “belt”, Assy. šibbu “girdle” (King, 1898: 388), CA: Old Huthaiyyil dialect sibbu “rope”, CA sababu id. as in the Koran: *falyamdudu bi-sababin ’ilā (ʾa)s samā’* (LA), Cush.: Som. seeb “belt”, Sid. “sibo “string, rope” (HSED, n. 2228).

**2.2.21** Akk. šapālu “be low”, CA safula “to abase, be low; down, bottom”, OSA s<sup>3</sup>fl “lowland, base”, Ug., Aram. špl “to lower, be low”, BHeb. šāpel id., Syr. šepal id., Mand. špl “be low” (Stehle, JAOS 60, 1960: 525; MD, 472), Sab. also s<sup>1</sup>fl “lowland, bottom, lower” (SD, 124-125): PHS stem \*pal- “to fall > be low, be down” as in CA falla “be defeated, to fall back, flee”; fallu “(things like scraps, bits) fallen down”, fillu “barren land”, i.e. *the rain did not fall on it for years*, Tham. fl “go away” (Branden, 1950: 517) = CA falla “go away, flee”. The stem is also found in the Semitic trilaterals [ʾpl] (§2.3.11 below) and [npl] (§2.11.22 below).

#### Comments

A root designating “to fall, cast; drop” should give rise in the course of time to a derivative having to do with “miscarriage; fetus, offspring” in one or more inflectional language in which the root is found. Like [ʾpl] and [npl] just mentioned above, which derives in Semitic into “son, fetus” (see §§2.2.28, 2.3.11, and 2.11.22 below), CA [sfl] also derives into ’asāfilu pl. “young of camel” as in Poet.:

«...’ilā ḡaladin minhā ḡalīli (ʾa)l ’asāfili» (LA).

**2.2.22** Ug. š’b “to draw water” (UG, 532), BHeb., BAram. š’b id. (OT, 1022), CA sa’aba “be satisfied with drinking, drink to excess”; mis’abu inst. “big jar” (CA saybu (sa’bu) “watercourse”, saubu (sa’bu) “a kind of wine” are variants of \*s-’ab), Sab. s<sup>1</sup>b “to draw water” (SD, 121), Egyp. mš’yab “place for drawing water” (EHD I, 287) = BHeb. maš’āb, CA mas’abu id.

a) The trilateral is also seen with initial /s/ instead of /š-/ as in Akk. sāb “to draw water”, JAram. sb’ “to drink”, Chad.: Mofu -sasab “to suck”, Gisi soḡ ~ suḡ, Daha seḡ, Zime sobo id., Kera soḡe, Mubi suva id. (HSED, n. 403). BHeb., too, has sb’ “to drink

to excess”; *sābā’*, *sābā’im* pl. “drunkards” (OT, 708) = CA *saba’a* “to drink wine”, hence *sabī’a-tu* fem. “wine” (swb, s’b above).

b) PHS stem \*’ab- “water” as in Akk. *abūbu* “flood”, CA *’abābu*, *’ubābu* “water”, Ge. *’ababi* “flood, wave” (DRS I, 1). An form [’ab] is below in n. d.

c) PHS \*’ab- is also seen in CA [š’b]. This trilateral has no verbal form. There is only the noun *šu’būbu* “copious rain”, perh. from \**su’būbu*, and the change of /s-/ to /š-/ is obviously due to seq. const. PIP *Nabīyah* said:

«...faḡad ’aṣābathumu minhā bi *šu’būbi*» (DN, p. 20, L. 7).

d) CA *’ubābu* above, as a vb *’abba* “to gulp water in large amounts, to drink without sucking”; *ya’būbu* “stream with much water”; CIV *’a’abba* = Cush.: Afar *a’ab*, *a’ub-*, Saho *-ō’ob* “to drink”, Som. *’abb* id. (HSED, 231). Stem [’ab] is certainly a compound of [’a’] “abundance” and [’ab] “water”. For proot [’a’], see §2.14 below.

It can be said that initial radicals of [’ab] and [’a’] are not variants of one form, as mentioned earlier. For an explanation of this phenomenon, see §2.11.15, n. 2.

e) As one should expect, the order of radicals [’b] can be reversed as in Egyp. *b’b’* “to drink”, CA *ba’ba’a* ~ *baḡba’a* id.; bu’- “rain”, Chad.: Cagu *va-*, *vo-* “to pour”, Mburku *vaw-* “to pour”, Sumray *bo*, Lele *boy* id. (HSED, n. 180).

f) Proot [’ab] or [’ap] “water” is seen in many CA compounds as, for example, *zayāribu* or *zayārifu* “abundance of water”; *baḡrun* (= sea) *zayrab* or *zayraf* “a sea with abundant water”. The element *zayru* expresses “abundance, copious, much of”. The commonly used root to express this meaning throughout the history of the language is [yʒr] as in *ḡazīru* id., as a vb *ḡazura*. Metathesis was due to the addition of [’ab] since it is much easier to pronounce the compound as *zayāribu/-fu* than \**ḡazāribu/-fu*, which does not exist.

**2.2.23** Tham. *ṣḡm* “be sick, ill” (Branden, 1950: 516), CA *saḡima* “be ill, sick”; *suḡmu* “illness”, BHeb. [ṣḡm] preserved in *ṣiḡmah* “a sycamore-tree ..., with fruit similar to the fig..., and hard of digestion... the fruit is used only by the poorest classes” (OT, 1085) = CA *sauḡamu* “a kind of tree, resembling the fig-tree in its hard fruit when it is unripe. As it turns yellow (i.e. ripe), it becomes sweet and is eaten by people, esp. the rich or upper classes”: PHS stem \*ḡim- (see §2.12.39 below).

**2.2.24** OAram. *ṣdr* “to send” (Rosenthal, AG, 14), OffAram., Palm., JAram. *ṣdr* id. (NWSI II, 1112), CA *sadara* “to wander, go aimlessly”; CVII *’insadara* “to hasten”: PHS stem \*dar- “to run, move” as in Akk. *darāru* “to run freely”, BHeb. *dārōr* “swift flight, spontaneous flow”: *dārar* “to fly in circle, run swiftly in a circle”, as a horse, Chad.: Tera *dara* “to run”, Mbara *dēri* “road”, Jimbin *dāru*, Miya *darhi*, Krk. *ndara* id. (OT, 233, 235; DRS IV, 319; HSED, n. 656, 657), CA *darra* “to flow, run fast”; *ta-dardara* “to go back and forth”; *dirra-tu* “running, flowing”; *darīru* “swift, quick” as in the PIP of Imru’ Al Qais:

«*darīrin* ka-ḡuḡrūfi (’a)l-walīdi ’amarrahu...».

a) In JAram., Mand. *ṣdr* also expresses “to twist” (MD, 450) = CA CIV *’adarra* “to twist tightly”; *darāra-tu* “spindle”: *dāra* “to turn around”.

b) By infixing -n- after the first radical in CA [sdr], we get a quadrilateral [sndr], with

a derivative 95haser95c-tu fem. expressing “quickness, speed” and also “daring”: CA [dar-] also signifies “be strong; dare” in dara’a “to attack, push back, make a sudden attack on”, Akk. durrū “repousser”, Soq. ’edre “95haser”, Berb.: To. adər “pousser très fortement”, etc. (DRS IV, 306), Sab. dr’ “to make a sudden assault on” (SD, 38), Egyp. dr “to drive out” (EHD II, 884), Cush.: Kafa dar id. The root is also seen in CA *inst.* mi-drahu “defender or protector of the tribe” with no verbal form or any other derivative (Al ‘Ayn IV, 24).

c) The stem [dar] also signifies “to flow, pour” as in Chad.: Housa ɗura “to pour”, Tangale ɗer, Pol ɗurəw id., Cush.: Saho, Afar darur “rain-cloud” (HSED, n. 747) = CA darra “to flow, pour out” above; mi-drāru “pouring forth copiously” as in Poet. (of Jarīr):

«hazamun ’aḡaššu wa dīmatun mi-drāru».

**2.2.25** Ge., S., W., Z., Tna. sāḡālā “to hang up”, Te. sāḡla, Amh., A. sāḡḡālā, Soq. siḡlhel “high”, Har. sāḡāla “to hang up”; (t)sēḡālā “to climb”, Tna., W. tā-sāḡālā id., etc. (HED, 141-142), JArām., Syr. šēḡal “to lift, raise”, Mand. šḡl “to take away, lift up, put up, raise” (MD, 473), SL s’ālē or s’āleh (i.e. šḡāl-) “a prop, scaffold” and with š- instead of s-: ša’al (i.e. šaḡal) expresses a caus. meaning “cause to lift up, raise”: PHS stem \*ḡal- in CA CIV ’aḡalla, caus. of ḡalla, “to lift up, raise”, CX ’istaḡalla “to rise (sun, bird, etc.)”; said of people, “lift up their belongings and carry them (to a destination)”; ḡallatu “top of mountain”, Berb.: Kab. aḡərru “tête”, So. aḡəllal “tête, cruche”, etc. (VPHS, 125, n. 233), Har. ḡala “upstairs” (HED, 123). The same proot is also seen with prefixed w- in §2.12.26 below, and perh. in Ug. šḡl “to arrive” (UG, 530).

**2.2.26** OArām. šyryt [š’r] “remainder” (Rosenthal, AG, 14), OffArām. š’r “to remain, rest”, š’ry “rest, remainder”, Palm., JArām. š’r “rest” (NWSI II, 1098-99), BHeb. š’r “to remain, be left over; remainder, remnant, residue, the rest”, BArām. š’r “remainder, residue” (OT, 1025), Sab. s’r “rest, remainder” (SD, 121), CA CIV ’as’ara “be left over, remained”; su’ara-tu “remainder, remnant, residue, rest”, pl. ’as’āru (Al ‘Ayn, VII, 292-293; LA) as in the PIP of Labid:

«’iḏā massa ’as’āra (’a)ṭ ṭuyūri šafat lahu...» (DL, p. 132, L. 7).

In addition, sā’iru “remainder, remaining” and also “all of, whole” = Sab. s’r id. (SD *ibid.*), Pun. š’r “rest (esp. of the family)” (NWSI II, 1099).

a) There are, of course, other meanings expressed by [š’r] in Semitic languages: in Akk. šēru “meat”, Ug. šir “flesh”, BHeb. šē’ēr “flesh, meat, relatives; blood-relationship, blood-kindred”, Pun. š’r “meat”, Sab. s’r “custom, practice” (for these meanings, see references above and Rabin, 1975: 91, n. 54). Such meanings and the notion “remainder” are all expressed in CA by \*’ar- as in ’ariy “remainder of food in a pot”; ta-’rī, said of two domestic animals, lit. “to join together and both become accustomed to one manger”, ’ariy “a crib”, ’iriy “stall”, Akk. urū, BHeb. ’urwā “a crib, manger”: CA ta-’arrā “to gather, e.g. *food*” = BHeb. ’ārā “to pluck off, to gather, e.g. *leaves*”, Eth. ’ry “to pluck off, to gather, e.g. *fruits, herbs*” (OT, 84; DRS I, 32).

b) For Akk., etc. “flesh, meat”, CA ’irra-tu “fat of the hump”, orig. “meat”: in *Hadith*, the Prophet said: «’ama’akum šay’un min (’a)l ’irra-tu?», Do you have some meat?



(LA, roots w'r and 'ry).

b) One of the basic meanings of the CA trilateral [ʾry] is “work, do, act” (LA) = Egyp. yr “to do, make”, Coptic ar, ari “to do”, etc. see §2.1.6.7., n. 6c above.

c) Some Semitists (Gesenius, Rabin, etc.) express the view that Semitic words for “meat, blood relationship” above may be from PSem. \*θ'r- in CA θa'ru “blood revenge for relatives” as a vb θa'ara, also in Sab. θ'r “blood revenge” (SD, 149).

For the time being, it may be sufficient to state that PSem. θa'r- is a compound of \*θa' - “kill, wound” and \*'ar-, perh. “do, make, act” (§2.1.6.7, n. 6c above).

**2.2.27** Akk. šuppū ~ suppū “to pray”, Aram., Syr. šbh “to praise”, Mand. šbh “to praise” (MD, 447), BHeb., BAram., Targ. šbh “to praise, laud”, Eth. sbh id. (OT, 1027; Ryder, 1974: 139), Hatra, Palm. šbh “to praise” (NWSI II, 1100), CA sabbaḥa “to praise God”. But in PIP and the Koran the CA verb also expresses, exactly like that of Akk., “to pray” (LA, r. sbh), perh. Egyp. sbh “to cry, call; prayer, cry, supplication”; sb'ḥ “propitiation” (EHD II, 658, 656), Chad.: Tangale *saba* “to speak”, Mesme *tchab* “to ask” (HSED, n. 461).

Semitic \*šbh “to pray” is neither from \*šab- nor from \*baḥ-. It *has to be* from the same root in CA bāḥa “to reveal, divulge”, etc.; CIV 'abāḥa “to allow”, Ge. 'abḥa id.<sup>56</sup>

The original meaning of the root may be “praise the *sun* or *būḥ*”, a compound word for ‘*sun*’ in CA, discussed in §2.13.24 below.

**2.2.28** BHeb. šeger “a fetus”, i.e. *which is cast forth at birth* and derived from “cast forth”, according to Gesenius (OT, 1035), BAram. šgr “cast forth, eject”: CA ḡarra-t (-t = fem. 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. ending), said of a pregnant woman or animal “to exceed the normal period of time to deliver a baby”, i.e. *go beyond 9 months for a pregnant female, 11 months for a mare, one year for a she-camel*, etc.; n. ḡarru. All are derived from a stem \*gar- as in CA ḡarra “to drag, pull, draw”. Evidence and explanation supporting this derivation come from a different HS trilateral [mgr], where prefixed /m-/, like /š-/, has become a part of the root in Hamito-Semitic languages (§2.10.48 below).

a) Aram. and Heb. [mgr] “to cast forth, to fall”, etc. = CA maḡara-t, said of a pregnant sheep, she-camel, “to emaciate and become ill to the extent that it cannot move”, in this case, *the womb may be ripped open, and the fetus is pulled out alive*; maḡaru “what is in the wombs of pregnant animals, i.e. *fetus*”. A number of derivatives are formed from this noun such as maḡara, which signifies “to sell a pregnant animal and its *fetus*”. For the semantic relation between “cast forth” and “fetus, child”, see §2.2.21 above & §§2.3.11, 2.11.22 below.

**2.2.29** BHeb. šāḡā “to magnify, extol with praises”, in Syr. “to praise, celebrate in song”: BHeb. ḡā'ā “to lift up oneself, rise; to be eminent, excellent, glorious”; ḡē'ē “high, lofty”; ḡā'ōn “majesty”, ḡē'ā “pride, haughtiness”, Ug. ḡ'an “arrogance, pride”, Pun. gu-ne pl. “exaltation, majesty”, Aram.: Jp. ḡē'ā “be high, great” (OT, 169; DRS II, 92; NWSI I, 207), Cush.: Ag., Bil. ḡūi “se lever, s'élever”, Sa., Afar oḡu, Ga. kaa, Bed.

<sup>56</sup> Related words may be Sab. bh-t “votive phallus” (SD, 33) = CA būḥu “vagina” also “soul/self”, Egyp. b'ḥ “the phallus of man or animal” (EHD I, 204).

yak id., Som. ogo “partie supérieure”, Berb.: To. iggi id., etc. (VPHS. 118, n. 196), Chad.: Migama, Bidiya gāyo “increase” (HSED, n. 849): CA ḡa’wā’u, said of army, “great, multitude” as in Poet.

«... bi ḡa’wā’i turdī ḡāfataihī ’al maḡānibu» (LA).

1) With caus. š-: CA has [sḡy] signifying both “to cover” and “be abundant” as follows:

1a) CA saḡā “to cover (usu. a dead person)”; CIV ’asḡā “to cover anything”: \*ga(g-) “to cover, roof” as in ḡa’ā “to hide, cover” also “to protect”: see §2.2.37 for HS cognates.

1b) CA ’asḡa-t also “be abundant” in a sentence like *It was not saḡwā’* (= abundant) *last year, but now ’asḡa-t* (= be or became abundant), OffAram. šg’, JAram. šgy, Palm. šgy’n pl. “numerous, abundant, multitude” (NWSI II, 1108). Variants with /š-/ exist: comp. BAram. sgh ~ sg’ “be multiplied, many; much, many”, in Syr. “to grow, be increased” ~ BHeb. šāḡā “to become great, grow”; *Hiph.* “cause to grow, increase” (OT, 1002).

A compound trilateral of [m-] and [gaW] will be studied in §2.10.43 below.

**2.2.30** BHeb. špy “be swept away by wind” (Ryder, 1974: 118), Chad.: Boka šipa-, Gabin šipen- “to blow”, Dghwede safa “to breathe”, Mafa saf id. (HSED, n. 2254), CA safa-t, said of the wind, “to sweep away the dust, wipe the dust off the face of the earth, scatter (the dust)” as in the PIP of Khansa:

«...’alaihi sawāfi (pl.) (’a)r rāmisi (’a)d dawārisi» (DK, p. 28, L. 3); sāfiyā’u “dust going with the wind”.

Also belongs here CA [sf], by reduplication, safsafa-t, said of the wind, = safa-t above; safsāfu = sāfiyā’u above, as in Poet.:

«wa hāḡa bi safsāfi (’a)t turābi ’aḡimuhā» (LA, r. sff); saffa “to sift” as in the Poet. of Ru’abah:

«...safsaf-na fi’arḡā’i hāwin muzmini» (LA ibid.).

PHS stem \*paW- “to scatter, disperse” as in CA fā’a id.; tu-faiyi’a, said of the wind, “move (trees, plants, etc.) to and fro” (see §2.11.44 below).

**2.2.31** BHeb. šādēmāh “a blasting, blight” (OT, 1036), CA sadamu “grief, regret, sadness, sorrow, frustration”; sadima “to grieve, be sad”; mu-saddamu “being troubled, angry”; sādimu “insane, due to cares and grief”. Here also belong Assy. šidimmu “raging hound” (King, 1898: 388) = CA sadimu “raging camel (can also be *stallion*, *bull*)” also “growl, roar”, Sab. s’dm “ill-health” (SD, 124) = CA mu-sadammu above, usu. said of beast of burden, “wounded in the back” as in the Poet. of Kumayt:

«ḡad ’aḡbaḡat bika ’aḡfādi musaddamatan...».

PHS stem \*dam- as in Assy. damāmu “to wail, lament”; dumāmu “howling, lamentation” (King, 1898: 343), Akk. dimmatu “gémissement, plainte”, Ge. dāmmat “cri, bruit”, etc. (Cohen, DRS IV, 274), Ug. dm “to lament, mourn” (UG, 533, 534) = CA damdama “to grumble, mutter, growl” also “be angry, speak with anger”, Egyp. dm “announce, pronounce”, Chad.: Housa ḡimī “sound”, Gisiga dimes “song”, Ngizim dāma “swear” (HSED, n. 706, 761).

To the stem \*dam- certainly belongs CA nadima “to regret, grieve at”.

**2.2.32** Akk. šēru “dawn”, CA saḥaru “dawn, the time when the morning begins to breathe; black and white”, Ug. šḥr “dawn”, BHeb. šaḥar id. (Shehadeh, 1969: 105), Phoen. šḥr id. (PG, 149), Moab. šḥrt id. (NWSI, II, 1122).

a) The same concept is expressed in Egyp. by a compound s’ ḥrw “dawn” (EHD II, 586, 634).

b) The obvious fact is that Semitic words are from a compound of [ša’], which is not the caus. prefix under discussion, and a stem ḥar-, signifying like ḥam- (§2.2.6 above) “heat; hot, be hot; heat” as in Assy. arāru “be hot, to burn; droughty” (King, 1898: 325), BHeb. ḥrr “be arid, to burn”, Syr. ḥrr “be dried up with heat”, Eth. ḥrr “be hot, to boil” (OT, 348), Sab. ḥr “fever” (SD, 71), CA ḥarra “be hot, to glow”; ḥāru “hot; heat”, Cush: Ga. aru, Sid. āri id., Har. ḥarāra “burn” (HED, 86)<sup>57</sup>. For the signification of [sa’], see §2.25.10, n. 56 below.

**2.2.33** BHeb. šāgaḥ “to gaze, look”; *Hiph.* “to look, to view” (OT, 1034), CA waḡaḥa “to appear, be manifest”; waḡāḥ-, in a fixed expression «*laḡaituhu ’adnā waḡāḥin*», lit. “the first thing to be seen”; true CIV ’awḡaḥa denotes “become manifest, clear” and false CIV “to conceal, cover” (for true and untrue CIV stem, see §2.21.1.1 below), hence wiḡāḥu ~ ’iḡāḥu ~ ’uḡāḥu ~ ḡāḥu “a curtain, a cover”; mūḡaḥu “a hiding-place, shelter” so as to keep away from observation < CA ḡaḥwa-tu “look, appearance”. Here belong with the same prefixed /w-/: Eth.: Tna. wāḡḥe “paraître (jour)”, Te. wāḡḥa id.; wāḡḥ “aube, point de jour” (DRS VI, 492): PHS stem [gaḥ-] (see §2.10.14, under *Comments* III below).

**2.2.34** BHeb. šāgal “to lie with a woman”; *Niph.* “be lain with, ravished, as a woman”, BAram. šēgal pl. “king’s wives” (OT, 1034-1035): CA CV ta-ḡallala, said of a male animal, lit. “to rise on its female and have sex”, Ge. galla, galala “to fornicate”, Amh. tāngallälä id. (DRS III, 126, n. 16). To my understanding, the basic meaning of [gal] is ‘rise above’, and will be studied in depth and with additional cognates and kindreds in §3.8.23 below.

**2.2.35** Ge. tā-sāṭwä “to take”, Amh. sāṭṭä “to give”, Har. sāṭä “to give”. Leslau (HED, 143) derives the Ethiopic words from Semitic \*wšṭ as in BHeb. hōšṭ “hold out to”. Leslau, like any other Semitist, does not feel obliged to explain with at least few words why BHeb. and Eth. words are related and how they could be derived from his reconstructed root, which, as we will see, does not fit the available evidence.

a) Semitic \*wšṭ accounts only for the BHeb. word whose real cognates are Ge. wəṣṭ “middle, midst, inside, in”, wəṣtat “among, amid”, Te. wəṣaṭe “inside, interior”, Tna. wəṣṭi “inside, within”, Sab. ws’ṭ “middle, midst, within, inside, during” (SD, 163), Qat. wšṭ “middle, inside”, Min. wšṭ “in”, Akk. ušṭu, išṭu “from, since”, CA wasaṭu “middle,

<sup>57</sup> The same stem may be present in BHeb. māḥār, Syr., Samar. mḥr “tomorrow” (OT, 558), OffAram., DAram. mḥr id. (NWSI II, 615), etc., and is ultimately derived from \*-ḥ- “sun” (see §2.13.24, esp. n. 4 below).

midst, among, between” also “waist”, i.e. *place between the two ends or in the middle of anything*, BHeb. *hōšīt* “to stretch out, extend”, BAram. *’ōšīt* id. (OT, 433; DRS VII, 645). For the relationship between “middle” and “extend, stretch”, CA *matā* “middle”; *matā* (*mata’a*, *matta*) “to stretch, extend”, e.g. *a cord*.

b) Eth. words for “to take, to give” = Sab. *stw* “to vouchsafe” (SD, 129), CA *saṭā* (as in *saṭaw-na* “we took”) “to take, take with the hand” (nowadays “to break into a house, steal; burglary”): PHS stem *\*ṭaW-* (§3.11.6). The root is also seen in Egyp. *š’d* expresses “to steal, pillage” (EHD II, 729).

c) CA also has *’aṭā* “to take (with the hand), hand over, deliver”; *’āṭī* “taking with the hand” as in the proverb: «*’āṭin bi ṭairi ’anwāṭin*»; *’aṭaw-tu*, said of anything, “I (= -tu) take with the hand”, as in the PIP of Imri’ Al Qais:

«wa ta- *’ṭū* birahšin ṭairi šaṭnin ka’annahu  
*’asāri’u dabyin ’aw masāwika ’iṣḥili*» (SHH VI, 2430-2431).

CIV *’a’ṭā* expresses an opposite meaning “to give”; *’aṭā’u* “giving, gift” as in the Koran: (ولسوف يعطيك ربك فترضى), *And soon thy Lord will give thee that you will be well pleased*, (93:5) and (عطاء غير مجد وذ) (it will be) *an incessant gift*, (11: 108). PIP Imri’ Al Qais also says:

«lamā *’a’ṭai-tu-hum ’illā suyūfan*  
*muḍarabatan wa’atṛāfa’a*» (DI, p. 68, L. 14).

In MSA and all dialects the trilateral [*ṭw*], together with its derivatives, has to do only with the notion ‘give’. An explanation of this linguistic phenomenon will be given in §2.2.47 below.

PHS *\*ṭaW-* is seen in CA [*nṭy*] as in CIV *’anṭā* “to give”, exactly like *’a’ṭā* above; *munṭā* = *mu’ṭā* = “given”. Old Arab scholars considers /n-/ a variant of /’/ and derives both from [*ṭy*] (LA). This view is rejected on the basis that /’/ and /n/ do not interchange position. An important question rises: *is [n-] a proot signifying ‘take’ or ‘give’?*

It is possible, however, that [*ṭw*] is a compound of [’-] = “great, abundant” and [*ṭaw*] “giving” (for [’-], see §2.14 below), and that [*nṭw*] is a compound of *\*na-* (for its signification, see §2.11, n. 6 below) plus *\*ṭaW-*

**2.2.36** BHeb. *šā’ā* “to make a noise, to rage, to roar, as floods; a tumult of people”; *šā’ōn* “noise, raging, tumult” also, as we should expect, “desolation, destruction” as in *bōr šā’ōn* “the pit of destruction” (OT, 1022, 1023, also see 1037). The suffix /-n/ of *šā’ōn* has attached itself permanently to [š’], creating a new trilateral [š’n] as in *šā’an* “to roar”. For the ultimate origin of both trilaterals, see §2.2.8, esp. n. b above.

**2.2.37** CA *suḡuḡu* pl. “roofs”, with no sg. form, is evidently from a proot *\*g-*, which is a perfect example of a ‘bound root’, i.e. *cannot occur independently of affixes or other roots attached to it*. Its cognates are Akk. *gaggu*, Ug. *gg* “roof”, EHeb., Pun. *gg* id. (NWSI I, 211-212; UG, 535): Berb.: Ayr, Tawlemmet *agəgu* “arch supporting a tent” (HSED, n. 873), Cush.: Ga., Saho, Tembaro *gogo* “hut” > Har., Amh., Gaf. *gogo* id. (Leslau, HED, 70), see *saḡā* in §2.2.29, n. 1a above, as well as §§2.1.6.5.4-2.1.6.5.5 above. The same proot is also seen as a vb *ḡā* “hide” in §2.10.34, ft 1 below.

**2.2.38** Akk. *šahānu* “be hot, warm”, Ug. *šhn* “be inflamed”, Ge. *shn* “be warm, hot”, Te. *sāhanā* “be warm, hot”, CA *suhnu* “hot”, *sahina* “be hot, warm”; *sahhana* “to heat”, SL and all others, the root also expresses “fever, sick, be sick”, BHeb. [*šhn*] obsol., preserved in *šəḥīn* “hot” as in *’ereš* or *šānā šəḥūnā* “hot country or year”, Syr. *šhn* “to ulcerate” (OT, 1045); JAram. *šhn*, Mand. *šhn* “become hot”: Chad.: Bokkos, Dafo-Batura san, Peo čeno “be hot” (HSED, n. 2172), Egyp. *shn* “skin disease, abscess”: NHeb. *šəḥīn* “eruption on the skin, abscess” (comp. CA *ḥarāra-tu* “eruption on the skin” from *ḥarru* “hot”). Besides, [*šhn*] (*suhn* “hot”, *sahhan* “to heat”; *suhūnē* “heat”). A kindred trilateral is seen in SL [*shm*]: *sahham* “have sexual intercourse”, from lit. ‘make + warm’. This is the same /-m/ seen in some Semitic trilaterals (e.g. see §2.4.5 below), assuming a caus. function, which originally did not possess, and it can occur in any position in the trilateral.

1) An earlier stage of [*šhn*], i.e. *before the adoption of /-n/ as a part of the root has been preserved intact in CA [shy ~ shw]*, which represents the earliest known caus. form of the root: *sahā*, actually expresses a caus. meaning, “(make) light a fire and spread embers and ashes, make an (air) exit for the fire to burn well” (LA): PHS proot \**haw-* as in Egyp. *hw* “fire, flame” (EHD I, 538), Chad.: Mbara *hū* “fire”, Bura *’u’u*, Kilba *hu’u*, Gulfey *u*, Buduma *au id.*, Kuseri *ahu*, Gulfey *u, id.* (HSED, n. 24, 1310): see §2.2.12 above, *the last two paragraph*.

2) A form much earlier than [*shy ~ shw*] is *sāha* [*syh*] “liquefy due *only* to the heat of the sun or fire”.

**2.2.39** BHeb. *šāṭaḥ* “to spread out, expand”, Eth. *sṭḥ id.*, Syr., Aram., Mand. *šṭḥ* “to stretch out” (OT, 1048; MD, 459), CA *saṭaḥa*, *saṭṭaḥa* “to spread out, stretch out”; *saṭḥu* “surface, roof”: BHeb. *ṭāḥā* “to stretch, extend” (OT, 364), CA *ṭaḥā* “to spread out, expand” as in the Koran: (والأرض وما طحاها) *and the earth and its expanded forth* (91: 6), also *ṭaḥḥa* “to stretch out, expand”<sup>58</sup>.

1) The trilateral [*sṭḥ*] gives rise in CA to the quadrilateral [*slṭḥ*], which cannot occur without the infix -n-, as in *’islanṭaḥa* (passive) whose meaning is more intensive than that of *saṭaḥa* above (ML III, 158). The infix -n- may be refl. and ultimately the same as -n- of CA CVII verbs as in CVII *’insaṭaḥa* “be spread out, be stretched out”. As for its /-l-/, it may owe its origin to *dissim.* of the first -ṭ- in CII *saṭṭaḥa* to /-l-/. For similar instances of *dissim.*, see §2.17.80 below.

2) A different view on the infix /-ln-/ is expressed by Bin Faris (ML III, 159), who considers it as signifying “magnificence (or grandness) and exaggeration”. CA /’al/ ~ /l/ can signify ‘grandness or magnificence’ before any proper nouns (see §2.12.17, n. 1b below).

3) SL (also in CA) both *saṭaḥ* and *baṭaḥ* express a similar meaning “to spread s.t. on

<sup>58</sup> CA also has *sadaḥa* “to spread s.t. on the ground, no matter whether one is lying on the back or on the belly” also “make lay on the ground”. It also expresses “to settle down” and “to kill” (Al ‘Ayn III, 131; LA) = *saṭaḥa* “to kill” = CIV *’aṭaḥa* “make perish, overthrow” (see §2.11.10 below).

the ground", but the marked difference in meaning between them is that for *baṭaḥ* "the face is downward", i.e. *lying flat on the belly (or baṭn<sup>59</sup>)*, *lying or spreading with face to ground*, while for *saṭaḥ* the face and back are in the opposite position since one is lying on his back (or *sa'*). There should be no doubt at all that /b-/ is a proot. For prefixed [b-], see §2.13 below.

Cognates are Heb. \*bṭḥ, *part.* bōṭēa "tomber par terre", SA: Soq. bṭḥ "se coucher, s'étendre", Eth.: Te. bāṭ belä, Tna. bāṭ bälä "être coucher de tout son long" (DRS II, 59).

**2.2.40** BAram., Targ., Syr. šzb "to free, deliver" (OT, 1044), OffAram., Palm., Nab. šzb "to deliver, save" (NWSI II, 1119), CA šaḏaba "to defend, free, dismiss" = ḏabba id. (LA), also "to prune (tree)" = haḏaba, which also expresses "to refine and deliver", hence "to educate, instruct" (LA). The reason for /š-/ instead of /s-/ is because of *seq. const.* Initial /h-/ of [hḏb] is caus. (see §2.4 below).

It may be interesting to note that haḏaba also signifies "to flow" as in Poet. (Thu Rimmah):

«...wa 'uhrā tu-*hḏibu* ('a)l mā' sāḡiru»

This notion belongs to an etymologically different root: *ḏāba* "to thaw" (see §2.3.33 below).

**2.2.41** BHeb. šā'ar "to estimate, to fix the value of anything"; šā'ar "a measure", CA CII sa'ara "to fix the price, to price; estimate"; si'ru "a price", BAram. š'r id. (OT, 1079): CA mi-yāru inst. "a measure"; 'aiyara "to measure".

**2.2.42** CA sadaḡa "to fabricate lies, to lie". This signification seems to be equivalent to that expressed by CV ta-kaḏḏaba of kaḏaba "utter falsehood, lie" (LA). For stem [dag], see §2.1.6.5.4, n. b above.

**2.2.43** OAram. šḥd "to give a present to" (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 7) also "to bribe", OffAram. šḥd "bribe, gift" (NWSI II, 1120), BHeb. šḥd "to give, make a present" (OT, 1044), CA \*saḥaḏa > šaḥaḏa because of *seq. const.*, "to sharpen, whet (a knife)" also "to beg"; šaḥḏānu "hungry man, beggar"; 'ašḥaḏa "to give to a beggar": PHS stem \*ḥaḏ- as in CA ḥaḏḏa "to cut off rapidly"; ḥaḏḏā'u "sharpened", ḥaḏā expresses at once "to measure + to cut", hence ḥiḏā'u "shoes". As for the notion of giving, CA ḥaḏā "to give", usu. *from spoils and booty*; ḥuḏya-tu "a gift you give to someone when he brings you good news"; 'aḥḏā "to grant, bestow upon".

**2.2.44** CA šaḥama "to stink, emit a strong offensive smell": ḥamma id. It is possible that initial \*š- is from /\*s-/ since such an interchange is quite common in the language.

**2.2.45** BHeb. [šḵp]: *Niph.* "to lie out over anything, to project", hence to bend forward, esp. 'to see'; *Hiph.* "to look down from heaven, so *of God*, to look out at a window": Ps. 14, 2; 53, 3, etc. are derived, according to Gesenius (OT, 1086), from the notion 'to lay

<sup>59</sup> BHeb. "womb, belly", etc. In Berb. būṭ "belly, navel", Chad.: Sura ḥut, Ang. ḥwut "belly, stomach", etc.

upon or over, to lay or cover with beams, joist' as expressed by CA [skf], hence BHeb. šekēp "a layer of beams, joists"; šəḳupīm pl. "beams or bars laid over, frame-work". Cognates are Sab. s'ḳf "roof"; ms'ḳf "roofed structure" (SD, 127-128), CA saḳfu "roof"; saḳīfa-tu "a large piece of timber or of stone like a plank used for making a roof". Bin Faris (ML III, 87) correctly defines the sequence of radicals [s ḳ f] as signifying 'height + overlooking and bending'.

1) There seems to be two distinct triliterals [šḳp] "beams, roof, etc.", perh. related to Egypt. ḳf'-t "wooden bolts or bars" (EHD II, 769) and [š-ḳp ~ š-ḳb] "to see" as in Egypt. skb "to see, to look at; the eye" (EHD II, 702) and sbḳ (*no metathesis involved*) "to be wise, learned" (EHD II, 659). The stem *ḳaf* is seen in CA ḳaffa "to pursue s.t. or s.o in order to know everything about" ~ [ḳfy], which expresses a similar meaning and occurs in the Koran (17: 36) in the negative sense: *lā ta-ḳfu* etc. = *don't pursue* etc. and is related to ḳafā "back of the neck; back"<sup>60</sup>.

2) As for Egypt. sbḳ, it seems to be based on the stem in CA baḳā "to see and wait" also "to wait and watch" as in *Hadith* of Ibin Abbās: «*fabāḳaitu kaifa yuṣallī* ('a)n *Nabiy*» (LA); *baḳā-hu* "look at him"; *baḳau-tu* "I wait for", Aram. beḳā "examine", Mand. bḳa "search". To understand how language changes in the course of time, taking as an example Egypt. sbḳ and CA [bḳ], read carefully §§2.10.14 & 2.13.25 below.

**2.2.46** Assy. ša'ālu "to ask"; *Piel.* pres. uš'al "to cry or clamor for, demand" (King, 1898: 390), Ug. š'l "to ask", OAram. š'l id., Pun., OffAram., Samal, Palm. š'l "to ask" (NWSI II, 1095-1097), Sab. s'l "to ask, demand"; s'ts'l "put forward a request" (SD, 121) = CA 'istas'ala, but of rare use, BHeb. šā'al "to ask", BAram., Syr. š'l "to ask for, interrogate", Eth. s'l "to ask, demand, beg" (OT, 1023), Har. tasā'ala "to implore, ask a favor from God", Te. sā'ala, Ms, W., Z. (tä)salä, etc. (HED, 136). All are from a compound of two proots: caus. *ša-* and [*'al*] as in CA "make a loud cry for, implore"; 'allu "shout, sound, groaning, moaning".

**2.2.47** BHeb. šādap "to scorch", BAram. šādap "to burn" (OT, 1036), CA CIV 'asdafa "to shine"; sudfa-tu "light" in the ancient dialects of *Kays*, etc., but "to be/become dark, grow dark", hence sudfa-tu "darkness" in the dialects of *Tamīm*, etc., and here CIV is 'asdafa ~ 'azdafa ~ 'ašdafa (LA, r. sdf). This linguistic phenomenon is called by old Arab grammarians 'addādu, *a word expressing two contradictory meanings and was thoroughly described by old Arab scholars but never explained*.

1. Among the earliest books on this subject are *Kitābu Al Addād*, written by Abu Hātim Siġistāni (born in 160 H) and another book bearing the same title, written by Muhammad Bin Ḳāsim Al-Anbāri (born 271 H). The works of Aṣma'I, Siġistani, Ibin Sikkit, and Ṣayāni on this subject were published by August Haffner (1918) in one book entitled: *Three Books in Addād* (in Arabic). For a brief and suggestive description of this phenomenon and a list of other old Arab scholars who wrote on it, see Siyūṭi in his *Muzhir* Vol. I, pp. 387-402. In modern times, there are many books on this subject, but all of them are reduplicates of the earlier work. The same phenomenon is noted in other

<sup>60</sup> Eth.: Har., S., W., Z. ḳft "forehead" (HED, 122).

Semitic languages like BHeb. as in *Piel* [brk], Eth. [brk] “to bless” also “to curse” = CA *bāraka* “to bless”; CVIII *’ibtaraka* “to curse” (OT, 160, n. 5), BHeb. *’wn* “strength; strong” also “be deficient in strength” = CA *’wn* “welfare, tranquility” (in BHeb. also “wealth”) also “hardship, exhaustion, weakness” (OT, 23f), BHeb. *’wr* “light” also “darkness”, in CA “flame”, in Syr. “light” but in Aram. “darkness, night”, reported by Kamal, 1972: 31-32. Again, the work on this phenomenon in Semitic languages has never gone behind the mere description. Kamal (1972), among other modern scholars, in his attempt to prove that the phenomenon is found not only in CA, but also in Syr. and BHeb., he collected some words from each language and compared them with their cognates in the two other languages. His work suffers from serious shortcomings, mainly due to the lack of knowledge of linguistics and probably to the misunderstanding of what the term *Addād* is.

2. Jewish and Syriac scholars do not admit the presence of *addād* in their languages and attribute words expressing two opposing meanings, like those cited above, to *euphemism* (Kamal, op.cit: 3-4). Some old Arab scholars, too, *insist*, exactly like Jewish and Syriac scholars, that CA does not have *addād* (cf. Siyūṭi *ibid.*, p. 396). All such scholars blind their eyes to a fact as clear as sunshine that *addād* exist not only in their languages, but also in all other Semitic languages as well as in Hamitic, esp. in Egyp. Generally speaking, *addād* are found in Hamito-Semitic on two levels:

3. *Addād* are found in individual Semitic languages, as shown above, and here the proportion varies very considerably from one language to another, the highest proportion being in CA and this is due to its unusual and unmatched *conservatism*. Some additional examples: Sab. *hgn* “noble born” also “son of a slave wife”, i.e. *lowborn*, (SD, 56) = CA *hġn*, which also expresses both meanings, Assy. *maṣāru* “to divide” also “be banded together” (King, 1898: 363), etc. As a matter of fact, instances of *addād* are found in many of the world’s languages, and are due to different historical circumstances. English *cleave*, for instance, can mean ‘*cut in half*’ or ‘*stick together*’ and Chinese *luan* means both “*confusion*” and “*bring into order*”.

4. In Semitic as a group, we sometimes come across *addād* when we compare cognates in two or more Semitic languages as, for example, BHeb. *š’d* expresses both “to go up, ascend” and in *Hiph.* “cause to descend” = CA *š’d* “to go up, ascend (a mountain)”, but in CIV “to go down, descend (a valley)” (OT, 899), CA *nbl* “be noble, to highly esteem; noble”, but its BHeb. cognate *nbl* “to lightly esteem, despise; stupid, foolish” (OT, 642), etc. It must be stressed here that this feature is not peculiar to Hamito-Semitic languages, but that it is found across languages, esp. *groups of related languages*: cf. Sanskrit *dā-* “to give” = Hittite *dā-* “to take”, Greek *πέpv* “to sell” = Lith. *pirkti* “to buy”, and so forth.

5. A natural question arises, *can this phenomenon be linguistically justified and explained?* There are some weighty reasons for the existence of *addād* in languages, and in this study we will confine ourselves to five principal reasons:

5a) By far the most important reason for this widespread phenomenon is the adoption of Proto-Hamito-Semitic negatives as integral parts of the words. Thus CA [frĥ] in *’afraĥa* “to sadden, make unhappy” is a false CIV verb, composed of [’-], i.e. *’a-* “not” plus [frĥ] in *fariĥa* “be happy”; the true CIV is *’afraĥa* “make happy”. The same



explanation holds true for [ʃ'd] in ʃa'ada “ascend”, false CIV [ʔʃ'd] in ʔaʃ'ada “descend”, BHeb. ʔwn consists of /ʔ-/ “not” + \*wn- “be weak, exhausted; weak, feeble” as in CA wanā id. For the negative /ʔ/ in Hamito-Semitic, see §2.21.1 below.

5b) Since the negative element is an affix, it is susceptible to drop in some, if not most, word forms in the course of time. This will cause the two words or stems, *originally expressing contradictory meanings by means of affixes, to fall together into one form*. For example, CA *manīnu* adj. may denote “strong” or “weak” and the noun *munna*-tu similarly expresses “strength” or “weakness” (Anbāri’s *Kitāb Al Aḏḏād*, n. 95). Its Egyp. cognate *mn* also expresses the same contradictory meanings “be weak, be sick” and “firm, brave, bold” as in *mn yb*, *firm of the heart*, brave (yb = heart), *mn-t* “something firm, staying power” (EHD I, 296-297). It seems evident that the earliest signification of [man] is “strong” and that it is related to \*man- “man” (§2.17.61 below). Based on the analogy of hundreds of cases, I suppose that CA had once both true CIV ʔamanna “make strong” and false CIV ʔamanna “make weak”. Of these two forms the first has survived: cf. Egyp. *ymn* caus. “make firm, to fortify”. In CA false CIV has lost its initial ʔa- and become *manna* “make weak”: see n. 5c below.

Another example is CA *rahā* [r. rhw] “to move fast, go fast” and “to move slowly, go slowly” (LA). One of which was probably at first false CIV \*ʔarhā, the antonym of \*rahā (comp. frḥ “be happy” with false CIV ʔrḥ “make unhappy” above), later, and upon the loss of neg. /ʔa-/, both have fallen together into one form. The Egyp. cognate [rh] expresses “to walk about, go, run” (EHD I, 429). A derivative of this root is CA *rahwa*-tu, which expresses both “high” and “low”, “elevated place” and “low-lying” (LA, Anbāri’s *Kitāb Al Aḏḏād*, n. 90).

5c) *Backformation* is therefore responsible for many words expressing contradictory meanings in the language, esp. when such meanings are expressed by CI or ground-stems. For example, *ṭariba* denotes “be sad” as in the PIP of Labid:

«wa ʔarānī ṭariban fī ʔiṯrihim  
ṭaraba (ʔa)l wālihi ʔaw ka-l-muḥtabal»

It also expresses “be happy” as in the Poet. of Abu ʔAbbās

«falā ḥaira fī (ʔa)d dunyā ʔiḏāʔanta lam tazur  
ḥabīban wa lam ya-ṭrab ʔilaika ḥabību» (Anbāri’s *kitābu Al Aḏḏād*, n. 57).

Suppose that the original meaning of *ṭaraba* is “be happy”, its false CIV ʔaṭraba is bound to express “be sad”. Speakers simply assumed that the \*ʔa- was the caus. prefix. Having made this assumption, speakers could then subtract the prefix to arrive at the ground stem *ṭaraba*, just as we can subtract the prefix /ʔa-/ of ʔaḥraḥa “cause to burn” and ʔaktaba “cause to write”, for example, and arrive at the ground-stems *ḥaraḥa* “burn” and *kataba* “write” respectively.

5c) The loss or reduction of derivational affixes can create *addād*. For example, CA *sāma* can express both “to offer for sale” and “to buy” (Anbāri, *Kitāb Al Aḏḏād*, n. 317). The second meaning is supposed to be expressed by CVIII ʔistāma, which is rarely used in the language, and the situation here is identical with bāʔa “to sell”; CVIII ʔibtāʔa “to buy”. The only difference is that CI bāʔa can’t express both meanings since ʔibtāʔa is still in use, whereas CI *sāma* can.

5d) Every root in Semitic *results from fusing together a number of morphological*

elements all having the same radicals in the same order, but with different origins and significations. For example, CA *fāda* can express “to die” and “walk in an arrogant manner” (Anbārī, *Kitāb Al Aḏḏād*, n. 318). For *fāda* “to die”, see §2.11.29, esp. n. 5c below, and for *fāda* “walk, tread”, see §2.3.44 below.

5e) For what concerns CA, it is in fact the sum of or a cover term for a number of slightly differentiated dialects. The pre-Islamic dialects on which it is based had certain linguistic features that distinguished each of them from all others. Among such features are words expressing two contradictory meanings. Some of such features, especially *aḏḏād*, have entered CA, and are thus recognized as of classical standard. In accordance with this fact, the two contradictory meanings expressed by [sdf] in CA was first *sadafa* meaning “be bright, shining”, later one group of dialects prefixed the caus. /ʾa-/, hence *ʾasdafa* “to shine, cause to be bright”, the other prefixed its homophonous negative /ʾa-/, hence *ʾasdafa* “be dark, etc.” above.

7) Returning to Semitic šdp “be warm, hot, to shine”, it clearly includes a caus. \*š- plus a stem \*[dap] as in CA *dafuʾa* “be warm”; *ta-dfiʾa-tu* “heating”, Egyp. *dp* “to shine upon” (EHD II, 876). Chad.: Musgoy *dafu* “hot, warm”, Kuseri *ndafu* id., etc., Berb.: Aksimen *ddfa* “warmth”, Cush.: Bed *duf* “sweat”, Bil. *dif* id., Darasa *daffa*, Xamir *duf*, *duuf* id. (HSED, 142).

7a) In CA and HS languages we also find a root with initial \*t- expressing the same notion as in Egyp. *tp* “to burn, fire, flame” (EHD II, 832), CA *tafiʾa* “to become fiery and angry”, Ga. *tifu* “fire, embers”, etc.

Both trilaterals are based on \*paʾ-, and this stem is also seen with a variant \*paʿ- in CA *fʾ-s* “fire” = Egyp. *pʾ* id. (see §2.1.6.9, n. 7b, under *Comments* II above). Note that the interchange of /ʾ/ and /ʿ/ is very frequent in Hamito-Semitic, esp. in CA and Egyp., and attention has already been drawn to this fact (cf. §2.1.6.5.1, n. 3, ft<sup>1</sup> above).

CA [fʾd], [dfʾ], [tf], along with their cognates, are from \*paʾ- and the affixes /d, t/ seem to be allomorphs of the same morpheme \*d- “make, cause”. This view does not dismiss the possibility that [dfʾ], etc. are compounds of \*dW-/tW- “shine” + \*paʾ- “fire”, and that the compound orig. expressed “shining fire”, and this special meaning of the compound distinguishes it from all other words having to do with “fire” in Hamito-Semitic.

7b) To PHS \*paʾ- also belong with caus. ʾ-, becoming a part of the root (see §2.3 below), Ug. *ʾpy* “to bake” (UG, 530), Phoen., OAram., OffAram. *ʾpy* id. (NWSI I, 94-95), BHeb. *ʾāpā(h)* “to cook, bake” (OT, 77), CA *mīfā* “oven”, from \*mi-wfaʾu < \*mi-ʾfaʾu < \*mi-faʾu. Possible Hamitic cognates are Chad.: Logone *fo* “fire”, Musgum *afu*, Gidar *afa*, Mbara *fē* id. (HSED, n. 819).

7c) There is still many other trilaterals based on \*paʾ-, an interesting one of them is seen in CA CI *ṭafiʾa* (rarely used), the commonly used stem are CIV *ʾaṭfaʾa* “to extinguish a fire” and CVII *ʾinṭafaʾa* “be extinguished (fire)”, Ge. *ṭāfʾa*, Te. *ṭāfʾe*, Har. *ṭāfaʾa* id. (HED, 152). CA-Eth. *ṭafiʾa* is back-formed from CIV *ʾaṭfaʾa*, the most widely used stem in CA. This explanation presupposes that CA-Eth. *ṭafiʾa* meant orig. “light a fire” and that *ʾaṭfaʾa* is a false CIV.

7d) The same proot is also seen in Sab. *wṭ* “to burn” (SD, 158), Ge. *wafaṭa* “cuire au

feu, rôtir, brûler”, etc. (DRS VII, 583). Final /-t/ is a proot and it may be from an earlier –t (§2.9 below), i.e. from \*waf’atu “burning”: for an identical /-t/, see §2.7.3, n. a below.

**2.2.48** BHeb. [šḵ’r] “sunken place, hollow”, analyzed as a blend of \*šḵ’ “to sink”, as in BHeb. šāḵa’ “to sink (down)”, and \*ḵ’r, as in CA قعر ḵa’ara “be deep” (OT, 1086). Heb. quadriliteral [šḵ’r] and trilateral [šḵ’] share in common with CA [ḵ’r] and [šḵ’] the same underlying structure: for CA /ṣ-/ , see below.

CA ḵa’ara “to deepen, be deep, get to the bottom of, make a bottom for (a well)”; CII ḵa’ara “make concave or hollow”; ḵa’ru, ḵa’rānu “a kind of dish” (= BHeb. ḵa’ārā); CV taḵa’ra “be deeply excavated, penetrate deeply into”, etc. all have developed from [ḵw’] in CA ḵā’u “low land” also “bottom” as in ḵā’u (’a)l bi’ri “concave bottom of the well”, with prefixed n- becoming a part of the root: naḵ’u “low lying land in which water stagnates”, hence *mustanḵ’u* “swamp, marsh”; niḵā’u the plural of naḵ’u = ḵī’ānu, the pl. of ḵā’u (see §2.13.7).

As for BHeb. šāḵa’, its CA cognate is certainly [sḵ’], preserved in the noun suḵ’u “what is under or lying beneath a basin” ~ suḵ’u [sḵ’] id.; suḵī’a-t (-t refers to earth) “be covered with frozen ice or snow”; šaḵī’u “snow”, seems to be from the notion of “falling”, and for the semantic relationship: cf. saḵīṭu “snow” from saḵaṭa “to fall” (§2.7.15 below).

1) The foregoing paragraph shows that the phonetic difference between CA phonemes /s/ and /ṣ/ is neutralized. *Because of the very great importance of this phenomenon and its marked and lasting impact upon the phonological system not only of Psem., but also of PHS, and because it is impossible to undertake a scientific comparative study of Hamito-Semitic languages without understanding this linguistic phenomenon and its implications, I find myself obliged to explain it thoroughly, starting with CA in which the phenomenon was partly described in the 8<sup>th</sup> century by Farāhīdī.*

It is important in the study of Semitic in general and CA in particular to keep in mind both the following phonological rules and their implications:

1a) Rule I. The difference in phonetic composition between /s/ and /ṣ/ is usually neutralized before /ḵ/. Farāhīdī (in LA, r. ṣḵ’) states:

«The Arabs have two variant pronunciations for any /ṣ/ before /ḵ/ and any /s/ before /ḵ/: some pronounce /s/, and others pronounce /ṣ/ without consideration of whether the /s ~ ṣ/ is in the vicinity of /ḵ/ or at a distance (separated) from it as long as they are together in the same word».

In application, the rule is sound and valid, but insufficient as an account of the widespread interchange of /s/ and /ṣ/.

1b) Rule II. Abu Muhammad Baṭlayusi (quoted by Siyūṭi *Muzhir I*, p. 469ff) says:

«Any /s/ followed by /‘, ʔ, ḥ, ḵ, or ṭ/ may be changed into /ṣ/... as in *yusāḵūn ~ yuṣāḵūn* “they are driven”, *ṣaḵru ~ saḵru* “sakar, hawk”, *ṣaḥru ~ saḥru* “rock”, *saṭru ~ ṣaṭru* “line, row”», and so forth.

To be correct and applicable, his rule should apply not only to /s/, but also to /ṣ/: cf. while *saḥru* and *saḵru* are variants of *ṣaḥru* and *ṣaḵru* respectively, *yuṣāḵūn* is plainly a

variant of *yusākūn*. Accordingly, Rule II should therefore be restated as follows:

*the contrastive feature of opposition between /s/ and /š/ is lost when they co-occur with any of the consonants cited above; so that /s/ can be pronounced /š/ and /š/ can be pronounced /s/. The exclusion of other emphatic consonants, namely /ḏ/ and ḏ/, is due to the fact that we can't have /s ~ š/ before or after them in a word.*

1c) Rule III. My comprehensive study of this phenomenon reveals that /s/ and /š/ exchange position no matter whether they are followed or preceded by any of the consonants above; they may also interchange position with the absence of such conditioning environments. Some examples illustrating the three rules are:

i) Rule I. /s~š/ before an emphatic or /ʾ, ɣ, ħ, ʕ/ as in *šaḵīlu ~ saḵīlu* “burnished (sword)”, *šaḵbu ~ saḵbu* “nearness”, *bāsiḵu ~ bāsiḵu* “lofty”, *suḵūfu ~ suḵūfu* pl. “roof”, *šaḵʾabu ~ saḵʾabu* “tall (of men)”, *laṣiḵa ~ lasiḵa ~ lazika* “to stick, glue”, *baṣaḵa ~ basaḵa ~ bazaḵa* “to spit”, *šaḵru ~ saḵru* above (also *zaḵru*), *šaḵara ~ saḵara* “to break a stone”, *šaḵaʾa ~ saḵaʾa* “to slap with the hand” also “to go”, *šaḵīʾu ~ saḵīʾu* “ice, freezing”; *ruṣṣu ~ ruṣṣu* “wrist”; *ṣayilu ~ saṣilu* “with thin legs, small body”, *ṣauyī ~ sauyī* “like or similar to me (?)”, *mayṣu ~ mayṣu* “stomach ache”, *ṣayṣaya ~ saṣṣaya* “to rub with fat” (also *ṣybl ~ saṣbl* id.), *raṣiʾa ~ saṣiʾa* “corrupt, vitiate (usu. the eye)”; *saḥbaru ~ saḥbaru* “kind of tree”, *suḥnu ~ saḥnu* “hot” (SL uses *ṣoḥn* as n. or adj. “hot; heat”, but *saḥhan* “to heat”), *ṣaḥabu ~ saḥabu* “tumult, noise”, *raṣaḥa ~ saṣaḥa* “be firmly fixed, rooted”, *ṣṭm ~ saṣṭm (~ stn)* “depth of the sea”, *baṣaṭa ~ saṣaṭa* “to stretch out, spread”, and so forth (Al ʾAyn; Jamharah III, 1726f, 1287; LA; Muzhir I; MA).

ii) Modified Rule II. /s ~ š/ occur elsewhere in the word regardless of whether they are preceded by any of the above-mentioned consonants or separated from them by one or more different radicals as in *safaḵa ~ safaḵa* “to close (a door)”; *ṣafḵa-tu ~ saḥḵa-tu* “a deal”, *ṣamallaḵu ~ samallaḵu* “smooth plain”, *ḵuʾāṣu ~ saḵuʾāṣu* “chest disease”, *ṣalḵu ~ saḥḵu* “low-lying land”, *ṣarḵu ~ saḥḵu* “silk”, *faḵaṣa ~ saḥaṣa* “to break (usu. s.t. hollowed like an egg or water-melon)”, *ʾaṣdu ~ saḥdu ~ ʾazdu* “sexual intercourse”, *ʾakiṣu ~ saḥiṣu* “ill-tempered”, *ʾaṣḥaya ~ saḥḥaya* “bestow upon”, *mayṣu ~ saḥṣu* “stomach-ache”; *ṣarṭaḥu ~ saḥṭaḥu* “solid place”, *saḥḥa-tu ~ saḥḥa-tu* “kind of land”, *ṣimāḥu ~ saḥmāḥu* “ear-hole”, *baḥaṣa ~ saḥaṣa* “to gouge out one’s eye, make + hollow-eyed”; *ṣyʾ ~ saḥyʾ* “to flow (water)”; *ṣaiyaʾa ~ saḥaiyaʾa* “be confused” (said of water running on the face of earth), *ṣyʾ ~ saḥyʾ* “to disperse”; *sāmiyān ~ saḥmiyān* “two sides of the mouth”, *ṣwḡ ~ saḥwḡ*, said of two brothers or sisters “being born right after him/her”, *ṣalḵaʾ ~ saḥḵaʾ* “be destitute of, be in want, in need”, *ʾaṣā ~ saḥā* “be hard”, *ṣlf ~ saḥlf* “behead”, *ṣalṭaḥu ~ saḥṭaḥu* “wide”, and so forth (Al ʾAyn; Jamharah ibid.; LA; Muzhir I).

iii) Rule III. The opposition between /s/ and /š/ is neutralized in many cases without a conditioning environment as in *ṣaddu ~ saḥdu* “mountain”, *faṣṣa-tu ~ saḥṣa-tu* “kind of wind”, *saḥabu ~ saḥlabu* “tall”, *raṣsa ~ saḥṣsa* “to keep s.t. fixed”, *naṣnasa ~ saḥṣnaṣa* “to hasten”, *nbs ~ saḥṣ* “to utter”, *naṣasa-t ~ saḥṣṣa-t ~ saḥṣaṣa-t*, said only of a woman, “separate from or leave her husband”, *ṣawasu ~ saḥawaṣu* “looking at s.o. with anger and arrogance, a kind of eye disease” also “brushing the teeth”, *waḥaṣa ~ saḥaṣa ~ saḥaṣa*

“to break, pound”, hasama “to break” ~ hašama id. ~ hāšā ~ hašara id., with each expressing a different shade of ‘breaking’, ‘ašhamu “black”; suḥma-tu “blackness” ~ ‘ašhamu “very dark, black”; suḥma-tu “dark brown” ~ ‘ašhamu “black”; suḥma-tu “blackness”, etc.

2) Unquestionable evidence from CA proves that /š/ in a good many triliterals and quadriliterals is from an earlier /s/. A fact that also holds true for all other Semitic languages. The following are *few* out of many examples that can be cited as illustrations.

2a) PHS stem \*ḡar- expresses “to burn” (Akk., CA, Egyp., see §2.8.28 below). Our new discovery makes it evident that CA has also preserved intact the causative form of this proot: ṣaḡara actually expresses a caus. meaning “make burn” (just like CIV caus. ‘awḡada “make a fire burn, kindle a fire, burn” from waḡada “to burn” (LA) = BHeb. yāḡad, OAram. yḡd, etc. “to burn”). A form with caus. s- also exists: saḡara, said of the sun as subj. “make the skin brown”; saḡru “fire”: cf. the Koran: (74: 26).

One may infix /-m-/ after the first radical to get a quadriliteral [šmḡr] as in ‘iṣmaḡarra = ṣaḡara. Old Arab scholars, however, recognized \*-m- here as an infix (LA), but, as it is often the case, they give a *caus. meaning* to ṣaḡara without recognizing /š-/ a variant form of caus. /š-/.

2b) CA ‘ašara “to imprison”; ma‘širu “jail” ~ ‘asara “to capture”; ‘asīru “captive, prisoner” = Akk. asīru “captive, prisoner” (AG, 67), BHeb. ‘asīr id.; ‘āsar “to imprison”, etc.

2c) CA našša “to lift up, elevate, raise” = BHeb. nāsas; *Hiphto*. In Zech. 9, 16 and Ps. 60, 6 “to lift up” (OT, 677).

2d) Ug. yšḡ “to pour” also “to cast (metal) and šḡy “to drink, give a drink” (UG, 532, 535), BHeb. yšḡ “to pour out, cast (metal)”; yašḡkā “a pouring out, casting of metal”: šḡy “to drink, give a drink”, ysk “to pour” (OT, 417, 1084, 406), Phoen. ysk “to pour”. The idea ‘*cast metal*’ is of course a later development and also expressed by n-sk, ysk (see §2.11.82 below) and by [sbk] as we will see below: Chad.: Diri, Miya, Jimbin sēka “to pour”, Angas šak “to filter” (HSED, n. 2176).

2e) CA ṣatama “make complete and precise, make perfect” [= ‘atamma]; ṣatmu “completeness, fullness” [= tāmu]; muṣṣamu adj. [= tāmu or mutammamu]; taṣṣīmu “completing” [= tatmīmu]. It becomes plainly evident that \*š- is from CA \*s-, this is in turn from PHS caus. prefix \*š-. The \*s- is prefixed to tam- “complete” (Ug., Phoen., etc. gen. Sem. *tm* id., Egyp. *tm* “to complete, finish, bring to an end”, etc.) in order to express a causative meaning “make complete” = CA CIV caus. ‘atamma “make complete”. See n. 2g below.

2f) ṣaffā “to filter, clean by filtering”; ṣafwa-tu “pure, unmixed (said of anything)” = SA: Meh. šōfi, Jib. šefi “clean”, Talm. šph “to filter”, Syr. špy “to purify, to cleanse from dregs”, Aram. špy “to file, i.e. *make smooth*” (OT, 1080), Mand. špy “to purify, cleanse, be smooth, quiet, clear, at ease” (MD, 471), OffAram. špy “to smooth” also as adj., said of water, “smooth, calm” (NWSI II, 1183) = CA ṣāfi adj., said of water or of sea, id., hence ṣafā-tu “smooth rock”. The very same ‘notion’ is expressed by [spy] as in Heb. spy “rake up”, Ge. sff “refine, purify”, Chad.: Diri sēfa, Siri cəfu “to sweep”, Bidiya sep id., Ngizim səpu “skim”, Mokilko sippe “remove foam” (HSED, n. 398).

Also belong here Chad.: Angas sup “to wash, be clean”, Housa çaf “well washed”, Mupun sūp “to wash”, etc. (HSED, n. 423).

2g) PHS stem \*tam- (n. 2d above) also denotes “to bring to an end, finish”, and possibly “to shut”. My view on this proot concurs with that of Gesenius (OT, 1108), who states: «*The primary idea seems to be that of closing, shutting up or off*». To my understanding, however, the idea is not ‘closing, shutting up or off’ in general, but in the sense of ‘completing’ = ‘finish’ as in this example: *At the finish* (= completion, close, & the like) *everyone laughed*.

By prefixing caus. \*š-, we get in CA šaṭama ~ šaṭama ~ sadama “to shut (a door)”, in Old Tamīm dialect a variant form [stm] occurred. In BHeb. we find sātam “to shut up, obstruct” with variants šātam occurring once in Lam. 3, 9, BAram. sətam “to shut up” (OT, 735), Mand. šdm, štm “to stop up, close in, restrain” (MD, 392), and with doubled caus. š-: Aram. šāstēm “to shut in” (Hurwitz, 1966: 43). It should be noted that [stm] is not a phonotactic possibility in CA proper, hence CI, the ground stem, \*satama is not recorded in Old Tamīm. In Egyp. the proot is found with caus. /ʾ-/ (= CA /ʾ-/; see §2.3 below) as in ytm “to shut, close, make an end of” (EHD I, 98).

The foregoing paragraph makes clear that, regardless of whether the stem is originally \*tam- or \*ṭam-, all prefixes \*/ʾ-, š-, ś, etc./ are variant allomorphs having here the same function and meaning.

2h) To my understanding, Hamito-Semitic stem [wasm-] (see §2.12.4 below) and [waṣm-] (see §2.12.36 below) denote one single underlying semantic content ‘mark’. The only difference in meaning between the two trilaterals lies solely in the nature of the *mark*, whether it is ‘good, of high regard’ or ‘evil, of low regard’. Accordingly, CA waṣma-tu denotes “mark of infamy”; waṣma-tu ʿārin “mark of shame (ʿārin = shame or stigma)”; waṣmu “shame, disgrace”; waṣama “to mark as disgraceful, shameful; stigmatize”, ma-wṣūmu, said of a man, “(man) of dishonor, of ignominy”, i.e. *marked with dishonor*: comp. ma-wṣūmu, said of a man, “(man) of goodness, of benevolence”, i.e. *marked with goodness, benevolence*; mīsamu (from miwsamu), wasāma-tu “mark of beauty” as in the PIP of Amr Bin Kalthum:

«...huliṭnā bi-mīsamīn ḥasaban wa dīnā» (ŠM, line 105),

and also in the expression: «ʾimraʾatun ḏāta mī-sam-in», a woman still having a mark of beauty (LA); hence wisāmu “mark (badge) of honor, stamp” = Assy. asāmu “be adorned”; simtu “honor” (King, 1898: 322).

2i) To my understanding, PHS stem [šum] is a compound of at least two proots \*s- and \*-m, and is seen in CA sīma-tu fem. “mark” ~ šāma-tu fem. “characteristic mark (usu. on the cheek)”, and in the Koranic musauwama-tu fem. (3:13), said of a horse or any other animal, lit. *marked or branded as well-bred*. The proot \*suW- is seen in Akk. wussū ~ mussū “to identify, distinguish” (DRS VII, 567).

A fundamental claim we make here is that PHS purely biradical *šumu* “name”, as in Akk. *šumu* id., etc.<sup>61</sup>, is a compound of [šu] plus [mu]. Its original signification is “a

<sup>61</sup> Ug., Phoen., Pun., OAram., OffAram., Palm., Hatra, JAram. šm, BHeb. šēm, CA ʾi-smu, Sab sʾm, Ge., Tna., Te., Amh., Arg. səm, Har., W., S. sum (NWSI II, 1155-1156, HED, 140), Chad.: Maha, Sura, Ankwe sum, Montol, Polchi, Tala sum, səm, Gera səma, Glm, Barawa šim, Kir wusum, wusəm, Masa šema, Cagu siman, Gaa, Gabin šima, Mbu, Geji šin, Berb.: Kabyl səmmi

mark (indicating identity)”. The first element of the compound is linguistically identical with \*š- in such HS roots as wsm, rsm, wšm, brš, rḳš, brḳš, nḳš, etc. see §2.15.24 below, while the second is most likely a prep. signifying “on”. For prep. [m], see §2.10 below.

3) /š/ from earlier /ḏ/ or /d/ may become /s/ in some Semitic languages under certain phonological conditions. For example, Semitic [ḏḥk] as in CA ḏaḥika “to laugh”, BHeb. ṣaḥak id., but in Eth. /-k/ becomes /-ḳ/ and consequently /š/ becomes /s/ as in Ge., Tna. sāḥaḳā “to laugh”, Te. sāḥaḳa, Arg. saḥaḳa, Har. sēḥaḳa id., etc. (HED, 138).

Among other examples from Hamito-Semitic intended to further illustrate the interchange of /š/ and /s/, see the following sections below in §§2.2.49, 2.2.50, and 2.2.59, paying special attention in the second section (§2.2.50) to the interchange of /b/ and /p/. Also see §2.3.1 below, etc.

**2.2.49** CA [šfd] denotes two different ideas: šfd I “give” and šfd II “fetter” (Jamharah II, 655-656; ML III, 293-294; LA, r. šfd), which belong to different origins or proots. For [šfd] II, see §3.17.38 below.

CA šafada “to give”, CIV ’ašfada id. as in the PIP of A’sha:

«taḏaiyaftuhu yauman faḳarraba maḳ’adī,  
wa ’ašfada-nī ’alā (’a)z zamānati ḳā’idā» (DA, p. 103, L. 1);

šafadu “giving, gift” as in the PIP of Nābiyah:

«...famā ’aradtu ’abīta (’a)l la’na bi (’a)š ṣafadi» (ŠM, p. 98, L. 50).

The verb, whether CI or CIV, does not precisely mean “to give”, but rather an idea close to “grant, bestow”, and its meaning is much closer to /wahaba/ than to /’a’ṭā/. CIV ’ašfadanī in A’sha’s poem means, according to LA, “He granted (= wahaba) me a leader to guide me”. If A’sha had wanted to say ‘grant, bestow’, and the like, he could have used CIV ’awhabanī without jeopardizing the rhyme.

According to Ašma’I, šafadu = *reward*. I believe that the deep meaning of ’ašfadanī here is “he profited or benefited me”, i.e. *make me benefit* = CIV ’ašfadanī id., from fāda “to benefit, profit”; fā’ida-tu “profit, interest, benefit”. This meaning is very close to that proposed by Ašma’I since one get ‘profit/benefit/reward’ in return for a service. It thus seems that A’sha uses two causative prefixes: /’-/ and /s-/.

One can substitute /r-/ for initial /š-/ and get a new triliteral [rfd] expressing “to give, to help s.o by giving” = Sab. rfd “help, assistance” (SD, 115). For proot [r-], see §2.15 below, and for proot [fa’ or pa’] “give” and for a further study of stem [fad], see §2.12.15, n. 2 & 3 below.

**2.2.50** BAram., Syr. šrb “be hot, dry”, BHeb. šārāb “heat of the sun”, CA sarābu “mirage”. The following comment by Gesenius (OT, 1087) is important for an understanding of the real meaning of ‘mirage’ in BHeb. as well as in CA:

«...the desert, either wholly or in part, presents the appearance of the sea or of a lake, so that the most experienced travelers are sometimes deceived... Hence we are enabled to understand Is. 1.

---

“call, name”, etc. (HSED, n., 2304, 2244). Note that CA ’ismu “name”; samma “to call by name, to name”. For the grammatical function of this /’-/, see §2.3.19 below.

C. *הַשָּׁרֵב יִהְיֶה כַּאֲשֶׁר הַיָּם* the mirage shall become a pool, i.e. the desert which presents the appearance of a lake, shall be changed into a real lake».

I should add that one who runs after *sarāb* is always ‘thirsty’, and that the heat of the sun in a desert makes him more and more thirsty. The problem is further complicated by the fact that *sarāb* takes place at noon, e.g. *in the hottest time of the day* (LA). Consider, for example, this verse of the Koran: *بَقِيْعَةٌ يَحْسِبُهُ الظَّمَانُ مَاءً حَتَّىٰ إِذَا جَاءَ لَمْ يَجِدْهُ سَيِّئًا* (كسراب), *as a mirage in a desert, the thirsty supposes it to be water; until he comes to it and finds it naught* (24: 39).

a) Besides [šrb], Semitic also have a trilateral [šrb] expressing the same sort of meaning as in Akk. *šarābu* “to burn”: CA *šarbu* “dry (trees, plants)”, Sab. *šrb* “type of incense” (SD, 114), BHeb. *šārab* “to burn, to scorch”; *šārāb* “burning”, BAram. *šarābā* (‘) “a burning” (OT, 905).

b) As one should expect, the voiced /b/ can be replaced by its voiceless counterpart, and the result is a new trilateral [šrp] expressing a similar meaning as in Akk. *šarapu* ~ *šarāpu* “to burn” (HSED, n. 459), Ug. *šrp* id., Heb. *šārap*, id. (Rabin, 1975: 87, n. 12), OffAram., Hatra *šrp* id. (NWSI II, 1194), Eyp. *srf* “be hot, warm, angry; heat, flame, fire” (EHD II, 681).

c) CA [šrp] expresses such different root meanings as [šrp] “oppress, afflict” is based on a stem \*šar-, [šrp] “to purify, smelt, refine” is based on a stem \*šap-, [šrp] “to spend, to dismiss”, etc.

d) In going back to *sarāb* in order to illustrate its semantic relation to “heat, burning”, we find that old Arab scholars distinguished between *sarāb* and *’āl*, another term for “mirage”, as follows: «*sarāb takes place at noon and is cleaving to the ground; so that one sees it as flowing water*», while «*’āl takes place before noon and is seen like water between earth and sky*». In Berb.: To. *eilal* “mirage”; m-lw “to flash, scintillate” = CA *’alla* id.

e) Finally, by shifting the order of radicals we get a new trilateral [ršp] as in BHeb. *rešep* “flame”, Samar, *ršp* “to inflame” (OT, 999): Chad.: Housa *ruḅuṣī* “hot ashes”.

f) The ultimate origins of HS trilaterals [šrb], [šrb], and their variants will be determined in §2.15.29, esp. n. d below, since evidence presented thus far is still insufficient and contradictory and shares in common with ‘*mirage*’ the same ‘*optical illusion*’.

**2.2.51** Eyp. *msnḥ* “to turn about, turn away, turn back” (EHD I, 325) is connected by Albright (JAOS 47, 1927: 218, n. 40) with CA *sanaḥa* “to turn”; CV *tasannaḥa* “to turn round”. Albright derives them both from a trilateral \*šnḥ, without justifying his choice of initial \*/š-/: PHS stem [naḥ] “to turn; side” as in Oakk. *n*’, i.e. \*nḥy “to turn” (Gelb, 1961: 179), CA *naḥw* “side, direction”; *naḥā* “to incline the weight of the body toward the left side in walking; to turn”: comp. *sanaḥa* (said of a bird, gazelle, or anything) expresses, according to one account “to pass by or come to from the right (this a good omen)”, according to another “whatever comes from the right to the left and gives you its/his left side”, according to some others “whatever comes from the left heading toward the right side”. In some dialects (as in Old Najd) *sāniḥ* = ‘good omen’ and in



some others (as in Old Hijaz) = ‘ill or evil omen’, the antonym of ‘*bāriḥu*’. Both *sāniḥu* and *bāriḥu* occur in this line of PIP Khansa:

«ḡarā liya ṭayrun min ḥimāmin ḥaḍirtuhu

‘alaika (’i)bnu ‘amrin min *sanīḥin* wa *bāriḥi*» (DK, p. 28, L.).

Moreover, both *naḥā* and *sanaḥa* denote “to come to one’s mind, return to one’s attention, to dissuade, to disregard”, etc. (LA).

The change in the order of phonemes does not result in any semantic change: CA *ḥanā* “to incline, bend, bow, to twist, turn”; CVII *’inḥanā* as the PIP of Amr Bin Kalthum:

«... wa ’asyāfun yaḡumnā wa *yanḥanīnā*» (JAA, p. 293, L. 82).

Besides, *ḥanwā’u*, said of a sheep, “turning her neck for no reason or illness”; *ḥinwu* “side, end, boundary; rib”, etc. = Egyp. *ḥn-t* “border, boundary, limit, end”, BHeb. *ḥānā(h)* “to bend, bow down, incline” (OT, 328).

### Comments I

It may be well here to give another sketchy account of Ibin Jinni’s theory of what he calls ‘*major derivation*’, since changing the order of radicals without affecting the meaning of the root is a common HS linguistic phenomenon.

a) Ibin Jinni in his *Khaṣā’ṣ* II, 130ff distinguishes between two types of derivation; *the major and the minor*. *Minor derivation* (الإشتقاق الأصغر) is the familiar type of derivation found in CA and other HS languages, whereby words are derived from a triconsonantal root by the addition of vowels and affixes. Among the derivatives of the triliteral [ʿlm], for instance, are: CI *ʿalima* “to know, learn, be acquainted with”; CIV *ʿaʿlama* “to inform”; taʿallama “to learn, educate oneself”; CX *ʿistaʿlama* “to inquire, i.e. *make oneself know*”; maʿlūmatu “information”; ʿalāmatu “sign, token, mark”; ʿālamu “world”; ʿilmu “science, knowledge”, and so forth. In this type of derivation, the order of the root consonants, i.e. [ʿ l m] remained unchanged in the formation of derivatives.

b) *Major derivation* (الإشتقاق الأكبر) refers to the formation of words by shifting the order of the root consonants. The underlying principle on which Ibin Jinni’s theory rests is that *radical consonants* (of a triliteral) *have close and fixed connection to meaning, no matter in whichever order such radicals are placed in the word*. For instance, the three radicals [ḡ b r], as they stand, denote “force, strength”. This signification remains unchanged, according to Ibin Jinni, regardless of whether any of the radicals is placed at the beginning, middle, or end. Accordingly, [ḡbr], [bḡr], [rḡb] and [brḡ] all have to do with the same notion, and various words connoting “strength” can be derived from each of them according to the rules of *minor derivation*<sup>62</sup>.

Another example of *major derivation* is [ḵ w l] “rapidity, swiftness”. Any change in the order of these three radicals in a word (i.e. wḵl, wlḵ, ḵwl, ḵlw, lḵw, lḵw) is uncorrelated with a difference in the basic meaning. It is plainly evident that the triliteral

<sup>62</sup> Among trilaterals whose radicals can be put in any of the six shifts without any change of meaning are [ḥfθ].

is orig. a compound of [ʾl], “*rapidness, flash* (sudden, brief, and intense display of light)”, and proot \*-k (for its signification, see below). For example, CA [wlk] is a compound of [wl] “to go, go away” as in walla id.; waliy “near to, close to; following”, etc. and \*-k, hence the basic meaning of walaḳu is «إسراعك بالشئ في اثر الشئ...» (LA), lit. *doing s.t. rapidly* (and) *immediately after* (= on the trace of) *another*; hence walaḳa “to move fast, to hurry”, walkā “running by leaps”, and CA ʾaliḳa “to flash or glitter and shine”; ʾalḳā = walkā above; ʾilḳatu “jumping rapidly”, hence ʾilḳu “wolf”; CA ʾalla “to flash, glitter” also “to hasten, to speed and shake”, ʾallu “rapidness, glittering”, etc.

Another example of the very same \*-k is [brk] “lightning; flash (of lightning), to lighten” as in Akk. birḳu, CA barḳu, Ug., Heb., brḳ, Earam. Brḳ, SA, Eth. brḳ “lightning”; Akk. barāḳu, etc. gen. Sem. “to flash, of lightning”, Cush.: Sid. banḳo, biraḳo, Darasa balaḳa, Kambatta banḳu-ta “lightning”, Chad.: Logone barak “lightning”, etc. (DRS II, 86; HSED, n. 226). All have developed from [bar-] as in Akk. barāru “to sparkle, flash, Ug. br “pure”, etc.: Cush.: Saho, Afar beeraa “morning”, Oromo barii, Som. bārri “dawn, morning”, Kambatta, Bambala barra “day”, Chad.: Mubi burburu “morning”, Ndam buri id. (DRS II, 87; HSED, n. 219). See examples of some other roots terminate with the same /-k/ in §2.1.6.5.10 above.

A question naturally arises: *what is the signification of proot \*-k?* To determine the signification of this particular \*-k, the obvious fact must be first recognized that \*-k is not part of the stem to which is suffixed since the basic meaning of the stem is quite clear without it. It is simply a proot suffixed to stems like [ʾal], [bar] (above), [ḥar], [dal], [šar], [šal]<sup>63</sup>, etc. (§2.1.6.5.10 above) to express a grammatical function. It is an allomorph of \*k- (see §3.17.83 below).

1) There is no denying that CA has much more trilaterals in which it is possible to reverse the order of radicals without affecting the meaning of the word than other Semitic languages and Egyp. (see, for example, §§2.2.50, n. e & 2.2.56.5, n. 1; §2.15.20 below, etc.) as in [ʾafku] ~ [fakʾu] “unskillful, left-handed”, [ḥbw ~ ḥbʾ] ~ [bwh], said of a fire, “to go out, extinguish”, [ṭʾr] ~ [rṭʾ] “have sexual intercourse”, [ḡbḡ] ~ [bḡḡ] “to drink, e.g. *a glass of water one time*”, [ḳḳʾ] ~ [ḳʾʾ] “bitter water”, [nsns] ~ [snsn] “to blow (said of wind)”<sup>64</sup>, [stḡ] ~ [sḡt] “to weave”<sup>65</sup>, [θḳl] in θaḳīlu “heavy” ~ [ḳθl] in ḳiθwalu id., [mḏḡ] “to chew” ~ [ḏym] “to bite lightly” (both from [ḏḡ]), [dwf] ~ [fwd] “to mix (with water or liquid)”, ʾaḳnabā-tu ~ ʾabnaḳā-tu ~ ḳaʾnabā-tu ~ ʾanḳabā-tu “with sharp talons (said of ʾuḳāb “eagle”)<sup>66</sup>, and so forth. Thaʾalibi (FL, p. 348, §70)

<sup>63</sup> Cf. CA šalā “to heat”; CIV ʾašlā “to burn”.

<sup>64</sup> Egyp. ysnsn “wind, air”.

<sup>65</sup> Both words are from [sty] “to weave”, and the /-y/ of [saty-] became /-ḡ/, thus giving rise to [stḡ], which in turn became by metathesis [sḡt]: for the change of palatal /-y/ to palatal /-ḡ/ in CA, see §2.6.13, esp. *the first two paragraphs*. Among its cognates are Akk. šatū “to weave”, Ug. sty id., etc.

<sup>66</sup> In this quadrilateral, /-n-/ is an *infix* and it is free to occur anywhere in the root (see §2.11 below), \*ʾuḳ perh. = ḳaʾwu “hook”. It is left for \*b to express “a kind of bird”, but I expect [pʾ] or [ʾp] to express this meaning.

distinguishes between two types of metathesis: *one involving the transposition of sounds within a word* as in *ġaḍaba ~ ġabaḍa*, *dabba ~ badḍa*, *bakala ~ labaka*, *tamasa ~ tasama*. The other is syntactic and does not concern us since it *involves a change in the order of words within a phrase or sentence*. However, this phenomenon must not leave the wrong impression that metathesis is also found in the derivatives of every pair of such roots. It is often that either:

1a) *The two trilaterals are unproductive as far as the process of derivation is concerned* like *ṭa'ara ~ raṭa'a* “have sexual intercourse”, *sataġa ~ saġata* “to weave”<sup>67</sup>, *baġaġa ~ yaġaġa* “to drink”, *ša'wu ~ waš'u* “small bird”, etc., with no other derivatives. Similarly, [ḵθl], unlike [θḵl], is unproductive, and *ḵiθwalu* is the only derivative of it (Al 'Ayn V, 137). But, to say the truth, the number of such unproductive trilaterals is relatively very small.

1b) *The two trilaterals are productive and denote different meanings*, but they have one or more derivatives expressing the same meaning as in *'uḵḵu*, said of water, “bitter” = *ḵu'u* id. Again, the number of such trilaterals is also small.

1c) *The two trilaterals have in common the same underlying semantic structure and some of their surface derivatives* like *dafu'a* [df'] “be warm; warm, heating, etc.” and *fa'ada* [f'd] “to burn, roast”; *fa'idu* “fire”, *ta-fa'udu* “fiery, burning, blazing”, hence the poetic term *fu'adu* “heart”. Wherever such cases are found, it is most scientific to analyze them as compounds or blends. There seems to be some evidence that PHS also had a proot \*dW-, perhaps connoting “to shine”. To this proot belongs Egyp. d' “fire, flame” (EHD II, 864) = CA \*dy in *ha-dā* “shine” (§2.4.15 below). For [df'], see §2.2.47 above.

2) Ibin Jinni's theory of *major derivation* has not been accepted by old Arab scholars. Siyuṭi (Muzhir I, 347-348), though admitting the presence of some roots supporting the theory, considers it as *unreliable and a false process of derivation*. He wrongly accused Ibin Jinni of putting forward the theory to show off his complete mastery over the language. Siyuṭi's view reveals clearly that his knowledge of this phenomenon and its widespread throughout the language is severely limited.

3) As a matter of fact, Ibin Jinni was not the initiator of the theory, but only the first to explicate it and coin a term for it, i.e. *major derivation*. He acknowledged in his book that he had learned this type of derivation from his instructor Abu Ali Fārisi (died in 377 H.). I strongly believe that the theory of major derivation began with the appearance of the first standard Arabic dictionary *Al 'Ayn*, compiled by Farāhīdi, who was born at the end of the first century of the Islamic era. He arranged his dictionary according to the point of articulation, starting with the pharyngeal and ending with bilabial consonants. The title of his dictionary is taken from the letter 'ayn, the voiced pharyngeal fricative /ʕ/, which is the first entry in the dictionary. In his explication of the lexicon, he follows precisely what came later to be called '*major derivation*', i.e. *every root is studied along with all permissible shifts of its radicals*. For example, in the section entitled: «/ʕ/ and /d/ together with /m/», he started with [ʕdm] and then began shifting its radicals to study [ʕmd], [dʕm], [mʕd] and [dmʕ]. As for the sixth possibility \*[mdʕ], he mentioned that it

<sup>67</sup> Both words go back to *sataya* (Ug. šty “to weave”, etc.) and the change of palatal /y/ to palatal stop /ġ/ is quite common in final position, a phenomenon will be discussed in §2.6 below.

is not a phonotactic possibility (Al ‘Ayn II, 56-63).

4) A more perplexing theory advanced by Ibin Jinni is تقارب الحروف لتقارب المعاني which may render: ‘*Consonants with a similar basis of articulation express similar meanings*’, as in *ṣāla* and *sāra* “to attack, jump”, where /ṣ/ & /s/ share in common the same point and manner of articulation, and /l/ & /r/ have the same point of articulation. Another example is ‘*azz-an*’ “to disturb and shake” as in the Koran: *ta-’uzzu-hum ’azzan* (19: 83), which expresses the same meaning as *ta-huzzu-hum hazzan*. Both /ʾ/ and /h/ share in common the same point of articulation. The use of /ʾ/ instead of /h/ is to express a stronger meaning.

5) Among other theories proposed by Ibin Jinni is ‘*correspondence between the sounds (that language uses) and the message they express*’ (157-168). Before clarifying and evaluating the theory, it may important to stress that Ibin Jinni (pp. 40, 165) defines and illustrates *onomatopoeia*, *the use of words that imitate the sounds of their referents*, possibly to make it clear that his theory is not concerned with this topic. He assumes that there is a direct connection between the thing language deals with and the sounds by which the thing is expressed. For example, the voiceless emphatic /ṣ/ sounds louder and stronger than its non-emphatic counterpart /s/. He compared *ṣa’ida* “to ascend a mountain, a wall, etc.” (= BHeb. *ṣ’d* “go up, mount”, etc.) and *sa’ida* “to ascend, i.e. *in the sense to become superior, famous, fortunate, be promoted*, etc.” (= Sab. *s’d* “beneficence, good fortune”, etc.). According to him, *the speakers* come to agree on *ṣa’ida*, with /ṣ-/, to express something that *can be seen*, like a man ascending a mountain, and *sa’ida*, with /s-/, to express something that *can only be apprehended mentally*, but cannot be directly seen, like someone becoming famous, etc. Another example is *ḵadda* “to cut lengthwise” and *ḵaṭṭa* “to cut widthwise”, etc.

Ibin Jinni does not tell, however, what language his ‘*primitive speakers*’ used when they first called on one another for a meeting to decide on what sound was to represent what idea or object. The much later theory of ‘*root-differentiation*’, as proposed by Gesenius, is similar to Ibin Jinni’s last two theories, and «*involves gradations in the intensity of the consonantal sounds of a root for the purpose of modifying its meaning*» (see Hurwitz, 1966: 30 for further illustration).

### Comments II

My brief illustrations of and comments on Ibin Jinni’s theories above should not leave the impression that I accept them as they are or reject them altogether. Although a scientific evaluation of the theories lies outside the scope of the present research, yet all what I can say about them is that *their characteristic weaknesses* lie in their ‘*overgeneralization*’ and ‘*lack of explanation*’. My comment on ‘*major derivation*’ may serve to illustrate what is meant by ‘*overgeneralization*’. As for the *second characteristic*, when he says that *ḵadda*<sup>68</sup> denotes “to cut lengthwise” and *ḵaṭṭa*<sup>69</sup> “to cut

<sup>68</sup> Heb., Aram. *ḵdd* “to cut”, Har. *ḵādāda* “to tear, cut through”, Tna. *ḵādādā*, Te. *ḵādda*, Amh., E., Ms, M, Go. *ḵāddādā*, Arg. *ḵāddāda* id., Cush.: Oromo *ḵood* “to divide”, Kaffa *ḵodi*, Mocha *ḵoodi* id., etc. (EHD, 122; HSED, n. 1601).

widthwise”, for example, (I add *ḵatta*<sup>70</sup> “to cut the root of or cut from the root”, *ḵaṣṣa*<sup>71</sup> “to scissor”, etc.), he either fails to account for this phenomenon, or, *much more likely*, he does not want to<sup>72</sup>.

On the other hand, the semantic difference between (say, for example) [ṣ’d] and [s’d] as illustrated above must be explained as follows: *when a phonological change takes place in some words or roots of a language in a way that it gives rise to two or more forms expressing identical or similar meanings like the change of /θ/ into /t/, /s/, /š/; of /t/ into /d/ or /ṭ/, of /ḍ/ into /ṣ/, /z/, or /ṭ/; of /ḍ/ into /d/ and /z/, of /s/ into /ṣ/ and /z/, and so forth, the language faces two possibilities in the course of time:*

(i) *to keep the original form and its variant(s) after differentiating between them in use, meaning, or productivity,*

(ii) *to keep only one of the two or more variants. For what concerns CA, it tends to keep all the forms by establishing the variants as autonomous roots expressing different shades of the same meaning.* Examples illustrating this fact are found everywhere in this research.

It is *unanimously agreed upon in modern linguistics* that there is *no direct relationship between meaning and the speech sounds which spell out the words that convey the meaning*. This entails that the relationship between *meaning and word* is ‘arbitrary’. The evidence often cited to prove this arbitrary relationship is that the same meaning, e.g. *tree, fire, man, cat, one, sheep*, etc., is expressed in different languages by phonetically very different sounds, e.g. the same meaning ‘*fire*’ is expressed in English by *fire*, in Chinese by *hwo*, in Arabic by *nār*, in Fox (an Algonquian language) by *aškotēw*, in Proto-Takanan (in South America) by \*ti, and in its neighboring Proto-Panoan by \*či’I, etc., the word for ‘*one*’ is in CA (and all Semite) *wāḥid*, in Indonesian *satu*, in Swahili *moja*, in Turkish *bir*, in Bulgarian *yedan*, in Finnish *yksi*, in Vietnamese *mot*, in Algonquin languages *nekot*, in Quechua languages (American Indian languages

<sup>69</sup> For its cognates in Sem., see §2.1.9.5, n. 1 above, under Comments: Cush.: Kaffa *ḵuṭ*- “to cut”, Bayso *ḵaṭ* “circumcise” (HSED, n. 1558).

<sup>70</sup> Har. *ḵat āša* “to cut in one stroke”, Cush.: Ga. *kutu* “to cut” (HED, 131), etc.

<sup>71</sup> For its cognates in Sem., see §2.1.9.5, n. d. above: Chad.: Housa *kāčā* “to scrape”, Cush.: Maji *ḵuṭ*- “circumcise” (HSED, n. 1531). Har. *ḵat āša* “to cut in one stroke”, Cush.: Ga. *kutu* “to cut” (HED, 131), etc.

<sup>72</sup> Ibin Jinni considers that /ṭ/ is ‘faster’ in cutting than /d/ and, for this reason, it is used with ‘width’ rather than with ‘length’, which takes a longer time. His comparison between [ḵṛṭ], [ḵṛd], and [ḵṛt] leads him to a conclusion *that there is a semantically hierarchical order of /ṭ/ (high), next /d/ (medium), and /t/ (low or light, i.e. not heavy)*. For this reason, /t/ alone is used with [ḵṛ] “blood” in *ḵarata*, said of blood, “to dry”. Ibin Jinni’s theory calls for the following brief comments:

a) *his conclusion implies that /d, t, and ṭ/ are allomorphs of one single morpheme.*  
 c) *he considers the root as having two distinct structures, the deep is of two radicals, and the surface of three radical.*  
 b) *he tacitly supports the biliteral theory.*

spoken in South America) *iskay* or *iškay*, etc. Such examples, *like any other similar examples one may think of*, do not serve any purpose and are mere ‘childish trivials’ since it is absurd to consider them as *primeval* words having never been changed in the course of tens of millennia. For those who regard such examples as genuine, it is sufficient to say that Semitic word *nār* “fire” above has evolved in the course of time from a stem ’aw- (see §2.17.1 below), and is one of tens of special terms for ‘fire’.

In conclusion, we have two competing theories concerned with the relationship between *meaning and word*; one confirms the relationship and another denies it. One of the two theories is undoubtedly correct, but neither succeeds in explaining and illustrating the presence or absence of *relationship* with *authentic* and *genuine* examples. Modern linguists without exception have failed to put forth *even ‘one single example’* to demonstrate the correctness of their theory, and Ibin Jinni chose the wrong examples to illustrate his theory: see §2.25, esp. n. 9c below for my *final and decisive word* on this particular issue.

**2.2.52** Akk. *šuharuru* “to calm”, Syr. *šhr* “to subdue”, CA *saḥara* “to subdue”, Mand. *šhr* “be troubled, anxious” (MD, 451): PHS stem [har] as in Egyp. *ḥrḥr* “to destroy”: *hr* “throw down, fall” (EHD I, 560), with caus. /ʾ-/ *yhr* “to make to fall, cast down”. For caus. /ʾ-/ see §2.3 below.

**2.2.53** Akk. *šanū*, Syr., Mand. *šny* “to change, alter”, BHeb., BAram. *šn*’ “to change, to alter” (OT, 1075), OffAram., Nab., JAram. *šny* “to change” (NWSI II, 1175-1176), CA: Koranic *ta-sannā* “to be changed, to change” (LA), Chad.: Fyer *saṇ* “to go”, Cush.: Oromo *seena* “to enter” (HSED, n. 2197). The trilateral is based on [naW-] “turn” (see §2.17.39 below).

To the stem [naW-] belong Egyp. *n* “to turn, to come”; *nny* “to go” (HED I, 339), Eth. *n*’ “to turn”. Chad.: Masa *nana* “to go”, Cush.: Oromo *naannaʷa* “to go round” (HESD, n. 1843).

**2.2.55** Akk. *šapāku* “to pour” (AG, 102), Assy. *šapāku* “to pour out” (King, 1898: 393), Ug. *špk* “to spill”, CA *safāka* “to shed blood, water, tears”, BHeb. *šāpak* “to pour out, shed”, Eth. *sfk* “to pour out metals” (OT, 1081; Shehadeh, 1968: 60), JAram., Mand., Syr. *špk* “to pour, instill” (MD, 472). All are possibly from a PHS word [pak] as in Egyp. caus. *s-fkk* “to pour out, be poured out” (EHD II, 666), BHeb. *pākā(h)* “to flow in drops, flow” (OT, 845). In CA the supposed cognate has a /k/ rather than /k/ as in *faḳā* “lochial” also *water place-name*, Egyp. also has *pḳ* “to pour out” (EHD I, 252).

a) CA *šaffaḳa* expresses a similar meaning “to pour water from one cask or vessel to another in order to filter it or make it pure” (LA, r. *šfḳ*). This is based on [šap-] “filter, make pure or unmixed”: §2.2.48, n. 2e above<sup>73</sup>.

<sup>73</sup> Other trilaterals expressing a similar meaning are CA *safaḥa* “to pour out, as *blood, water, tears*”; *ma-sfūḥu* “wide open”, and with /š-/ instead of /s-/ CA *šuffāḥu* “wide”; *šaffaḥa* “to widen, spread out, expand, as *metal into plates*”; *šaffiḥa-tu* “flat stone” = BHeb. *צפיה* “flat cake, so-called from its spreading out”, etc. (OT, 902, also see r. *שפה* p. 1080) = Assy. *sapāhu* “to scatter, loose” (King, 1898: 393) = Eth. *sfi* “to spread out” as n. “expansion, breadth”. In addition, BHeb. *sāpaḥ*,

b) There is another trilateral [škb] expressing a meaning similar to that of [špk] as in CA sakaba “to pour out (water), to pour from any vessel (pitcher, jug, tea pot, and the like) into glasses”, Phoen. škb “to lay out for irrigation” (NWSI II, 701, see mškb), BHeb. škb (in Job 38, 37) expresses, according to Gesenius (OT, 1053), “to lay down or incline a vessel, hence *to pour out, to empty a vessel*. This meaning can also be expressed by [kab-] as in CA kabā, said of a vessel “to incline it, i.e. *to pour out what is in it of water*”, i.e. *make it empty* (LA; ML V, 156), a signification that can also be expressed by *kafa’a*. The basic meaning of CA [kb] and Heb. [škb] is “to incline, etc.” (see §2.2.12 above) and of CA kafa’a “to *incline* s.th. in order to make empty of whatever it contains”, and not “pour out”.

d) By shifting the order of radicals of CA [skb], we get [sbk] as in CA sabaka “to cast metal (gold and silver), to melt metal”; sabīka-tu “ingot of gold or silver”: Eth. sfk above. Notions of “to pour out” and “cast metal” are both expressed in Semitic languages by [n-sk] (§2.11.82 below).

#### Comments

1) I admit that /š-/ is caus., but I am reluctant to accept [pak] as a PHS *proot* regardless of the weight of evidence supporting it. The reason for which I accept or reject a *proot* is much weightier than any evidence, one may call it strong or compelling, furnished by the entire Hamito-Semitic language divisions. To be established as a *proot*, the form must meet one or more of the following *three strict conditions*:

1a) *It should be found in other traditional roots combined with affixes or proots.*

1b) *There should be no roots presenting evidence that calls to question its reconstruction.*

1c) *If the root is in use in SL, it is my intuition which determines its status, and not Hamito-Semitic evidence.*

2) For what concerns roots in ft. <sup>1</sup> of n. 1 above, they are compounded from š-pa’- (see §2.2.30 above) and a *proot* \*-ḥ- signifying in some roots “spreading, expending, stretching”. It is the same *proot* seen in HS [ptḥ] “to open” (see §2.1.6.10, n. c above), [šṭḥ] “spread out, etc.” (see §2.2.39 above), etc. Until I establish \*-ḥ- as a *proot* with additional evidence and discussion, it may be interesting to consider the signification of [lḳy] and [lḳḥ] in SL: CX mi-stal’ī (< CA mustalkī) “lying down” and CV mi-tli’īḥ (fr.

---

like CA safaḥa, expresses “to pour, pour out” and also [špḥ] in the derivative mišəpāḥ “the shedding of blood”. Gesenius (OT, 730) considers the word as a derivative of [spḥ]. This is a compound of \*s- and \*paḥ-, perh. the very same \*paḥ in HS ptḥ “to open” (§2.1.6.10, n. c above).

It is to be born in mind that interchanges of /s/, š/ and /š/ is not rare in BHeb. and we have so far seen some examples illustrating this fact. Additional illustrations are: šwr “to go away, depart” in Hos. 9, 12 ~ swr (OT, 716-717, 1007) sp̣ḵ ~ šp̣ḵ “to vomit” (OT, 731), sp̣ḵ ~ šp̣ḵ “to strike, to smite with the hand so as to make a noise” (OT, 731) = CA sf̣ḵ ~ šf̣ḵ “to clap” (and by metathesis and voicing of /s/ zḵf), BHeb. šg’ ~ šg’ “be great” (see §2.2.29 above), kns ~ kns “to gather together, assemble” (OT, 478), etc.

a supposed \**talaḳḳaḥa*) “lying down + stretching one’s body”.

## 2.2.56 SOME EXAMPLES OF /s-/ INSTEAD OF \*š-

**2.2.56.1** CA *sa’ama*, caus., “to feed, nourish”: PHS \**am-* “to feed, eat, swallow” as in Egyp. *s-’m*, caus., “make to eat, feed”; *s-’m* “make to swallow” (EHD II, 645): *’m* “to swallow” (EG, 557), Cush.: Kwadza *am-* “to chew”, Iraqw *ayim id.* (HSED, n. 1064). This same proot is seen in BHeb.-Baram-CA quadrilateral [*sl’m*] (see §2.17.80 below).

**2.2.56.2** Akk.-Assyr. *sahālu* “to pierce”, Chad.: Sura *sul*, Chip *səl id* (King, 1898: 372; HSED, n. 406) with /s-/ instead of \*š- ? *It is a compound of \*ša- plus \*hal-* “to pierce, bore” as in CA *halla*, BHeb. *ḥālāl* “to bore through, pierce” (OT, 317), Akk. *halālu* “to pierce” (Ryder, 1974: 110), Phoen. *ḥll* “to pierce” (PG, 101). The same biliteral is seen with prefixed /n-/ in §2.11.25 below.

**2.2.56.3** CA *sa’ara* “kindle a fire, flame up a fire”; *sā’ūra-tu* “fire”. If BHeb. *sā’ar* “be violently agitated” (OT, 729) is cognate, then its /s-/ is from \*š-: PHS stem \**ar-* “fire” as in Egyp. *s-’r*, caus., “make a fire to burn” (EHD II, 645). To this proot may belong Chad.: Housa *sōya* “to roast”, Angas *sūr*, Bolewa *surru*, Gera *sur*, Tera *zurr*, Ngizim *sur*, Kirfī *šuru*, Mafa *sawar*, Gudu *sārā id.*, Burma *sure* “to burn” (HSED, n. 2271). The same PHS stem appears with initial glottal stop (see §2.17.1, n. 3 below).

**2.2.56.4** Ug. *sgr* “to shut, close” (UG. 532, 535), Phoen. *sgr* “to shut” (PG, 126), BHeb. *sāgar* “to shut, close”, BAram., Syr. *sgr id.* (OT, 712-713), OAram., OffAram. *skr* “to stop up”, DAram. *skr* “to close” (NWSI II, 786-787), Akk. *sekēru* “to dam up”, Mand. *skr* “to stop up, block, shut up, hinder”, *sgr* “to shut up, keep in” (MD, 318), Sab. *s’kr* “barrage” (SD, 125), Akk. *šigaru* “lock” (Shehadeh, 1968: 119) also “bolt, cage” (MD, 318), EHeb., OffAram. *msgr* “prison”, Samal. *msgrt id.* (NWSI II, 663): Chad. \**skr* “to close” (RPAA, n. 512).

1) CA CII *sakkara* “to shut, close”; CI *sakara* “to subside, abate, become still” also “dam up” = CA *sāḡīru*, *masḡūru* “still, quiet, quiescent”; *musauḡaru* “fettered, chained”, Akk. *sekēru* “dam up”<sup>74</sup>. See §2.11.80 below.

<sup>74</sup> Final /-r/ in [*skr* ~ *sgr*] is a proot by itself, and notion of “abate, be silent, still” can also be expressed by *sakana* and by *sagā*, the last verb expresses a combination of two units of meaning: *sakana* + *to last* (§HH VI, 2372). One can also say: *laila-tun* (= night) *sāḡīya-tun* ~ *sākina-tun* ~ *sākira-tun*, with the same sort of meaning. SL *sakan* “be still”; CII *sakkan* “to soothe, mitigate, make calm” is perceived to be based on a stem *kann* “become quiet, still” (for its kindreds, see §2.2.13 above), while [*skr*] is used for things in the physical world like ‘*sun*’, ‘*wind*’, or ‘*night*’ and expresses ‘*be still + last ~ continue*’, as if it were drunk. Sab. *s’kr* “to placate, pacify (deity)” (SD, 125) corresponds to CA [*skn*] rather than to [*skr*], the common Semitic root for “be drunken, intoxicate”, as in CA *skr*, Ug., Heb. *škr*, etc. *id.*

One can suffix -t to [*sak*] and get a trilateral [*skt*] as in *saktu* “silence”; *sakata* “be silent”; *sākitu* “silent”, BHeb. *sākat* “be silent”; *Hiph.* “to keep silence” (OT, 723). Both *sakata* and *sakana* can be used interchangeably when the subject is a noun like ‘*anger*’ (Al ‘Ayn V, 305). Nowadays, only *sakana* can be used.



2) Egyp. s-gr, caus., “to make silent, to still, silence” ~ s-kr “put to silence” (EHD II, 626-627): PHS stem \*kar- ~ \*gar- “be silent”, preserved in CA in the following proverb «*aṭriḳ karā ’inna (’a)n-na’ āmi fī (’a)l-ḳurā*», where *karā* means “be silent” (LA).

**2.2.56.5** BHeb. sāḥap “to scrape, scrape away, sweep away with violence, *as rain which sweeps all before it*” (OT, 718) ~ šāḥap “to bark, hew, chip off, i.e. *by hewing, planning*”; šaḥpet “consumption”, JAram. šḥp “to scrape, grate” (OT, 1045-1046; MD, 440), OYem. \*šḥf “to bark, skin”: šaḥfu “skinning”, reported by LA = SL šaḥfē (from \*šāḥfa-tu) “a small and thin piece of anything (usu. taken from the upper surface of anything, e.g. stone, trunk, etc.), CA [šḥf] as in saḥafa “to bark, to scrape, to shave the head, to skin, depilate”; saḥīfa-tu “a violent rain which sweeps all before it”; suḥāfu “consumption”.

The trilateral under study is certainly based on [ḥap] as in BHeb. ḥāpap “to rub, scrape, wipe off; to wash off or away” (OT, 334), CA ḥaffa “to bark, depilate, chafe, fret by rubbing (the upper surface of anything), to shave (the head, beard)”; ḥaff-ānu, pl., “servant” = Phoen. šḥpn “servant” (NWSI, II, 1121).

1) *Is initial \*s-/š- an old caus. or part of an old stem \*saḥ-?* It should be noted, however, that Semitic has a root \*saḥ- expressing “to sweep away, wipe off”, as in BHeb. šḥh id., in Syr. “broom, brush”, in BAram. “to wash” (OT, 718), CA saḥā id., saḥā-tu “bark, peel, shell, skin, etc. of anything”; saḥā “to peel, skin, pare” (ŠḤḤ VI, 2373). Moreover, shifting the order of radicals as in [šḥp ~ ḥsp] does not change the basic meaning: cf. BHeb. ḥāsap “to strip off bark, to peel, to scale, to scrape”, CA ḥasafa “to peel dates”, etc. (OT, 333).

**2.2.56.6** Moab. šḥb “to drag”, Heb. sāḥab id. (NWSI II, 781), CA saḥaba “to drag, draw along upon the ground” (OT, 718), Ge. sāḥabā “to drag”, Te. sāḥba, Amh., Gaf. sabā, Arg. sāhaba id., Har. zēḥaba “to drag on the ground” (HED, 165), but in Sab. s<sup>3</sup>ḥb “be swept away by floods” (SD, 138). All what I can say about this trilateral is that it may be based on a stem [ḥab] as in CA ḥabā “to creep, crawl”. This statement tacitly implies that /s-/ is not caus., since we can say saḥḥa “to become fat, i.e. *spread outward*”, saḥḥa, said of water, “to flow copiously from above, flow on the face of the earth”; saḥsaḥa, said of rain, lit. “to flow so copiously that it sweeps everything before it”.

The word ḥabā is related to \*ḥub “snake, serpent” as in CA ḥubābu, Har. ḥubāb id., Te. ḥabba “wind”, Amh. əbab “serpent”, Arg. həwaw, A. əbab, S. imbab, etc. id. (HED, 79).

#### Comments

*Is [šḥb] related to [zḥp] in CA zaḥafa “to creep along the ground”, SA: Meh. zehāf, Shh. zḥaf “to creep, crawl” (HSED, n. 2605)?* It is important to remember that most roots beginning with [zḥ-] express “to slide, glide, slip” and “move away from a place,

---

CA saḡana “to confine, imprison”; siḡnu “a prison, place of confinement”. For possible kindreds, see §2.11.80 below.

remove from a place” (zḥl, zḥlk, zḥn, zḥkl, zḥh, zḥb, zḥk, zỵh, etc.), and that /s/ and /z/ interchange position is a good many Semitic roots.

Some examples from CA illustrating \*š- > \*s- > /z-/ are: zu‘fūku “stingy and ill-tempered”: ‘afịku “stupid, foolish, peevish”; ‘az‘akiyyu [z‘k] adj. “short and fat”: ‘akauku [‘k] id.; za‘afa “to kill fast”; zu‘āfu ~ zu‘āmu “abominable death” (clearly from ta-waffā “die”, related to da‘afa id.: see §2.1.6.5.22 above); za‘aba “to fill, esp. *with water*”: clearly from ‘abba “to fill” (§2.2.22, n. d above)<sup>75</sup>, zaṛada-tu “produce sounds from the mouth, esp. *by women on happy occasions, like wedding*”: ṛarrada “to sing, chirp”, zfy ~ sfy “blow (wind)” (see §2.2.30 above), za‘aba “to drink exceedingly” ~ sa‘aba (§2.2.22 above), and so forth. The radical /z/ can be from /š/ as in zammī-tu ~ šammī-tu “silent” (see §3.21.3, n. 4 below), etc. Interchange of /z/ and other radicals will be brought to light whenever occasions demand (see, for example, §§2.3.31; 2.3.32; 2.3.34, etc. below).

In Egyp., too, \*š- > s- > z- as in zmn “to stay, dwell”, Chad.: Housa zamna, zauna “to stay”: PHS stem \*man “to stay, dwell” (§2.3.35 below). To the same stem belong Egyp. smn “to remain still”, Chad.: Musgum samana “to sit”. The words have been wrongly treated as being from two different roots in HSED, n. 2608, 2189.

**2.2.56.7** BHeb. sagrīr “rain, heavy rain”, BAram. sagrīrā, Syr. sgr id. (OT, 713), CA saḡara “to fill with water, to pour, flow”; masḡūru “filled, full of water” as in the PIP of Labid:

«’aw bāridu (’a)š-šaiḫi ma-sḡūrun mazāri’uhu...» (DL, p. 55, line).

The Semitic trilateral seems to be based on a stem [gar-] “to flow” as in CA ḡarā “to flow, run”; ma-ḡrā “(water)course”, Phoen. \*m-gr “river Magoras” (PG, 94), CA ḡarḡara, with reduplication, “to pour”; ḡarru “watercourse, stream”, Syr. gerā “to flow”, SA: Hars. gerō, Jib. gere “to flow, run” (DRS III, 168). The stem [gar] is also seen with prefixed /n-/ in §2.11.71 below.

**2.2.56.8** Cohen (VPHS, 87) connects CA s’y “agir, aller” with Heb. ‘šy “faire” = Cush.: Ag., Bil. es, is, Saho is, iš, Afar is, Bed. as id., whereas Gesenius (OT, 821) connects the Heb. root with CA ‘sy “be apt”. Other cognates are: Ug. ‘šy “to do, make”, Sab. ‘s’y “to work, to acquire” also, as a sort of ‘work’, “to buy, to sell” (SD, 20-21), Chad.: Mokilko ’ise “to do, work”.

a) Comparison of Heb. and Sab. cognates suggests that the medial radical is /-š-/ rather than /-ś-/ , and that CA cognate is certainly sa‘ā whose basic meaning is “to work, to do”. As in very numerous cases, Semitists do not know the basic meaning of the CA root. LA quoted Zajāj as saying that the root meaning of [s’y] is ‘to work’, hence in the Koran (53: 39): (وَأَنْ لَيْسَ لِلْإِنْسَانِ إِلَّا مَا سَعَى), where sa‘ā = “to work”, and in (20: 15): (لَتَجْزِيَّ كُلَّ نَفْسٍ بِمَا تَسْعَى), where ta-s‘ā = “to work and gain”, etc. Like Sab. ‘s’y “buy, sell” above, CA sa‘a-t, said only of a female slave, expresses “to commit adultery only in the sense to ‘work’, i.e. *work to get money and pay her master* (as tax imposed upon her by the master)”. This practice was prohibited in Islam.

<sup>75</sup> This is one of large numbers of instances showing that compounding, as in [‘ab], antedates the use of affixes.

b) Comparison of CA [s'y] and its HS cognates, accompanied with the fact that CA 'asā, said of the hand, "it swells (or 'thickens') from *work*" strongly suggests that the CA root is from ['sy].

## 2.2.57 Some Examples of Undetermined /s/

**2.2.57.1** BHeb. 'ānaš "to impose a fine, amerce"; 'ōneš "fine, mulct", BAram. 'nš "fine, mulct" (OT, 804), Pun., Palm. 'nš "to exact a fine"; Niph. "be fined, be punished" as subst. "fine; humble" (NWSI II, 877-878), CA 'anaša "to battle"; CVIII 'i'tanaša "to oppress": PHS stem 'an- "to oppress, subdue, jail, humble" (see §2.8.2 below).

The question rises here: *Is final \*-š a caus. suffix or the same \*-š we have seen in §2.1.6.9 above?*

**2.2.57.2** OAkk. knš "to bow down" (Gelb, 1961: 176), Assy. kanāšu "to submit, bow down"; ukanniš "force into submission"; *Shafel*. ušakniš, ušikniš; *Part*. mušaknišu "cause to submit, bring into subjugation" (King, 1898: 353), with suffixed rather than prefixed caus. \*š- = CA CX 'istakāna "be submissive and humble or humiliated", which is classified by LA as CVIII of [skn]. To justify this wrong classification of the verb, LA says:

«'istakāna, with a stem {'iFta'āLa}, is formed from maskanatu (= submission), and its /-a-/ (i.e. the vowel of its second radical /-a-/ becomes /-ā-/ because it is stressed, and this is quite rare as in the Koran: (فما استكانوا لربهم), where 'istakānū (-ū = they) is originally 'istakanū...It is said CI sakana, CIV 'askana, CX 'istakana, tamaskana (formed from miskīn 'humble, submissive, humiliated'), and 'istakāna "be submissive and humble"».

1) The form in question is CX of a dead verb \*kāna [r. kyn or kwn] signifying "submit, subjugate", since, as a rule, CX stem of any hollow trilateral root (i.e., one whose middle consonant weak and is either -w- or -y-) is {'istaFāLa} as in 'istafāda "to get benefit, benefit oneself": fāda "to benefit" [r. fyɖ], 'istaṭā'a "to be able": ṭā'a "to obey" [r. ṭwʕ]<sup>76</sup>. Abu Ali Farisi rightly considers 'istakāna as CX of \*kāna: see (c) below)

2) The dead verb \*kāna has been preserved in 'iktinā-tu "submission and humiliation", which appears as being derived from CVIII \*'iktāna. Ahmad Bin Faris (ML V, 148), however, termed 'iktanata [kwn] as a strange verb without explaining its meaning, but on page 140 (of the same volume) he cited a root [knt] deriving into kanata, CIV 'aknata لزم وقط = "be still and content or satisfied (the signification implies 'submission')"; CVIII 'iktanata may signify "be content (with one's present situation = submission)" (see LA, r. kwn).

3) My view is that /-t/ of kanata is a suffix (for a thorough discussion of this suffix,

<sup>76</sup> However, few hollow verbs like 'istaḥwaḍa "to possess, have" do not change /-w-/ to /-ā-/ in CA X stem: ḥāḍa [r. ḥwɖ]. Very few others may have *both stems*, but often with a *difference in meaning*, e.g. 'istaḡāba "to comply (i.e. make oneself acts in accordance to a request)" and 'istaḡwaba "to interrogate": [r. ḡwb] "to answer, reply".

see §2.9 below), and that the verb is from \*ky-n. As for *'istakāna* above, it is definitely CX of \*kāna (see LA, r. kyn), preserved in CIV 'akāna "bring into submission, make subservient" = Assyr. kānu "to humble oneself, make obeisance" (King, 1898: 352).

**2.2.57.3** We have seen in §2.2.13 above that [škn] "dwelling (place), to dwell" is a compound of caus. /š-/ and a word [kan]. If we suffix the same /š/ to [kan], we get Sem. [knš] as in CA kināsu "shelter (for animals), hiding place" as a vb taknišu "to hide oneself" = CIV 'akanna [r. kn] "to hide" (when one is inside his/its dwelling or shelter, he/it is actually hiding oneself, hence 'akanna, 'istakanna "be inside the dwelling place > to hide, keep away from observation"). The same holds true for taknisu, said of an animal, BHeb. kānas "to assemble, collect" also "to hide"; mikənās "drawers", *worn by the Heb. priests in order to hide the parts of shame*; Hiph. "to hide oneself, wrap oneself in anything", BAram. kənaš "congregation, synagog", Eth. kns "to assemble" also "church" (OT, 476, 566).

#### Comments

As I expect, there is no difference *in depth* between Sem. [kan-] "to cover, to hide" and Sem. [gan-] id. (§2.1.6.5.4 above).

**2.2.57.4** CA ḥamīsu "oven" is unquestionably from [ḥam] "to burn, heat; hot" (see §3.2.6 above). Its final \*-s is linguistically identical with BHeb. \*/-š/ or /-s/ in ḥeres "the sun", in proper names *har ḥeres* 'Mount Heres' = "mount of the sun", perh. from \*ḥrs ~ \*ḥrš "dry, arid, hot": BHeb. ḥrr "dry, arid, parched", in Syr. "to dry up with heat", in Eth. "be hot" (OT, 348), in CA "hot; heat", etc.

CA and Heb. \*/-s/ ~ /-š/ may not be from the caus. prefix in question. Farāhīdī (Al 'Ayn III, 137) defined ḥarasu as «*a period less than ḥiḳba-tu fem.*»<sup>77</sup>. It appears that CA ḥarasu orig. denotes "a type of year", like *sana-tu* (gen. Sem. šn- "year"), 'āmu (Sab. 'wm "year"), ḥawlu "year", (perh. extending from rabī' to rabī' (rabī' "spring (season), grass", and rb' = "four" in all Semitic languages), ḥirmisu "droughty year" (the -m- seems to be an infix), *siltimu* "hard year", *kamītu* "a whole long year or month", *karītu* "a whole year (or month)", *ḡuruzu* "droughty year", and so forth. Moreover, the word under study is preserved intact in a number of compounds.

**2.2.57.6** BHeb., Eth., Aram., Mand., etc. škb (§2.2.12 above) also signifies "to have sexual intercourse" = CA kabasa "to have sexual intercourse, to mate (of birds)", with suffixed rather than prefixed /š/, from kabba "to throw oneself on", Tham. tkbs "fecundity" (Branden, 1950: 518) = CA takbīsu "impregnation (usu. used with birds)",

<sup>77</sup> The word ḥiḳba- expresses according to one account "a period of time having no limits" and to another "a year" (LA), but in Jamharah I, p. 281 = "year". In old Qais dialect, however, ḥuḳubu = "year" (LA). The Koranic ḥuḳubā (60: 18) has been interpreted by different scholars as "a year", "two years", or "years" (LA), and its plural form ḥuḳbu or ḥuḳubu = "80 years", according to Farrā' in his interpretation of the Koranic 'aḥḳāba (23:78). SL ḥi'bē ~ ḥi'beh denotes "period of time", i.e. *in the sense 'a group of unbroken periods of time'*. It could be 'a number of years', but never 'a year', and is usu. used *in the past*. It is most likely a compound of [-ḥ-] "sun > time" (§2.2.32, n. b above) + -ḳab (§2.2.59, n. c below).

BHeb. *kābaš* “to force a woman” (OT, 447).

Proots like -t, -ḥ, etc. can be suffixed to [kb] to form new trilaterals expressing significations revolving round the notion “press (down)” as in *kabata*, *kabaḥa*: see §2.9.16 below.

d) The verb *kabasa* also expresses in CA “to press down, to squeeze” and is certainly related to *kabasa* above: cf. CA *waṭi’a*, for example, expresses both “to tread” and “have sexual intercourse”, *depending on the object*. Its cognates in Semitic languages are Akk. *kabāsu* “to tread down”, BHeb. *kābaš* “to tread upon, trample under foot” (OT, *ibid.*) ~ *kābas* signifies both “to tread, trample with the feet” (OT, 446) and “to cleanse, rinse” (Ryder, 1974: 111), Ug. *kbs* “to wash” (UG, 537). The notion “wash, rinse” certainly comes from “squeezing or pressing hard upon clothes when washing them in order to clean them well or extract water”.

**2.2.57.7** OffAram., Samal *ktš* “to beat, crush, press” (NWSI I, 548-549), BAram. *ktš* “to pound, to smite, to war”, BHeb. *kātaš* “to pound” (OT, 498), etc. are all based on stem *kat-* (§2.11.46, n. a below).

**2.2.57.8** Egyp. *sns* “to smell”: *sn* “to smell” as in *sn d* “smell the earth”, *sn d* “smell (kiss) the hand”; with caus. /’-/ (§2.3 below) *ysn* “to sniff, smell, kiss” (EHD II: 603, 608, I: 89). Egyp. [sn] also signifies “to breathe” and is related to Saho, Afar *san* “nose”, Som. *san*, Sid. *sano*, Darasa *sano*, Hadiya *sane*, etc. “nose” (HSED, n. 2194).

## 2.2.58 CA [sḵb ~ ṣḵb]

1) CA *sḵbu* or *ṣḵbu* “near to, close to; vicinity, nearness”; *saḵiba* “be near”; *ṣuḵbu* “neighbor”; *’aṣḵab* ~ *’aṣḵab* “nearer” (LA; ML III, 85). Since the special meaning expressed by the word is confined to “a dwelling” as in ‘My house is *sḵbu* (i.e. near) your house’, the prefix \*s- seems to be a preposition signifying “near, by”, perh. related to *siwā* “except, amid, another, etc.” with *sawā* “together”. It is unquestionable that *siwā* in the following verse of poetry is unequivocally synonymous to *ṣawb*, *lī*, or *naḥw* “toward, to”:

«wa li’ aṣrifanna *siwā* Huḍaifata midḥatī

li fatā (’a)l’ aṣiyyi wa fārisi (’a)l’ aḥzābi» (ṢHH VI, 2385; LA).

Old Arab lexicographers do not say plainly that the particle in question is a *prep.* expressing “toward, to”, nor do they classify it as such in the language. They rather try to illustrate its meaning in a sentence: *ḵaṣad-tu* (= “I head to, I go directly to”) *siwā* (meaning?) *fulān* (= somebody); *’ay* (= that is) *ḵaṣad-tu* (see above) *ḵaṣda-hu* (his direction): cf. *ḵaṣdu* “direction”, i.e. إتحاه /’ittiḡāhu/ “toward”.

a) It is plainly clear that CA *siwā* here is a survival of PHS \*s- as in Sab. *s’* “toward, to” (SD, 121), which also appears in Sab. with extensions as *s’wn* “toward, to” and, with /-w-/ being assimilated to the following dental, *s’nn* “toward, in front of, next to, by”; *b-s’n* “with”. Other variants are *ws³n*, *s³nn* (SD, 129).

b) Based on the discovery of *prep. siw* in CA, we may analyze Akk. *šabāb-*, Syr., Mand. *šbb* “neighbor” (MD, 459), etc. as a compound orig. meant “next door”, i.e. *consisting of* [sau-] “next to” and [-bai] “one’s place = ‘home’ (see §2.9.22 below). The

CA cognate is *šawbu* above. In a sentence like *I am going šaub Ali* = I am going to Ali's place, home, or location, i.e. toward Ali. *Naḥw* "toward, to", orig. "to the side of" can't substitute for *šaub* in the sentence.

c) In going back to [sḵb] *near, vicinity*, etc. above, the syllable [ḵab] sounds to me as being etymologically identical with the first part of {ḵab-l}, a Hamito-Semitic prep. and adv. "before" and adv. of time "before (in time), afore" as in BHeb., BAram. ḵbl prep. "before, in front; opposite" (OT, 908), Mand. ḵabil "in front of, facing", Cush.: Ag., Bil. ḡab, De, Qu. ḵabil, Ch. ḵau, Sa., Af. ḵam "devant" (VPHS, 124, n. 227), Sab. l-ḵbl prep. "before, in front of"; l-ḵbly "during"; and surprisingly ḵbl ~ b-ḵbl "before (of time)" (SD, 102-103) = CA min ḵabl id. CA *ḵabla* is mainly used as an adv. of time "before in time, afore" and may be used as prep. as in *muḵābil, ḵubāla-t*, etc. "before, in front, opposite".

The adverb *ḵablu* "afore, before (of time)" seems to be a compound of stem [ḵab] "a measure" and \*-l- "afore", thus ḵablu = "time + past, afore". For a deep discussion of proot [-l-], see §2.17.15 below<sup>78</sup>.

d) [sḵb ~ ṣḵb] as in "tall; erect"; *šaḵaba ~ saḵaba* "to raise, erect"; *saḵbu* "the tallest post or pillar of a tent" is a compound whose second element \*ḵb- is seen in ḵubba-tu "dome"; ḵabbu "head of a tribe and its master, head", as a verb ḵabbaba: BAram. ḵabēb, BHeb. ḵābab, Syr., Mand. ḵbb "to curve, arch, vault, make convex or concave" (OT, 908), Chad.: Tera kəba "hut", Gude kuva id. (HSED, n. 1599). This particular /s-/ is etymologically different from all /s's/ discussed so far.

<sup>78</sup> It is certain that \*-ḵab is related to ḵāb as in the Koran: (فكان قاب قوسين أو أدنى), *thus was (he) the measure between two bows* (facing each other) *or nearer* (still) (53: 9). The term *ḵāb* signifies "measure", according to Farrā' and Ibin Athīr (LA) (= OffAram., JAram. ḵb "measure of capacity" (NWSI I, 977), Egyp. ḵby, Heb. ḵab "measure": cf. VPHS, 125, n. 230), but "length", according to some others (LA). Of these two views, the former is correct in this context. The proot here is certainly \*ḵW and is seen in a number of roots as in Assy. ḵa "a measure" (King, 1898: 381), CA ḵiyāsu "a measure"; ḵāsa "to measure"; ḵīs "the measure of" (= ḵad ~ ḵadru id.: see §2.1.6.7, n. 6c above), Egyp. ḵws-t "a measure". Ahmad Bin Faris (ML V, 46) considers *ḵābu* as being from *ḵīdu*, i.e. *its radical /-b/ is from \*/-d/*. The fact is that /-b/ and /-d/ are two different proots combined with \*ḵy-. A variant root of ḵīd is ḵadā (MA, 325).

## 2.3 *PHS CAUSATIVE* /'-/

This is a morpheme prefixed to CA CI verbs, strong and weak, to form CIV verbs, along with their derived nouns and adjectives. Its meaning is essentially causative ‘make’ and, as mentioned earlier (see §2.2 above), its equivalent form in Akk., Ug., etc. is /š-/ in BHeb., Sab., etc. is /h-/. Besides CA, the morpheme is also found in Eth., Aram. dialects (BAram., Syr., Targ. etc.), and occasionally in BHeb. Some examples from CA illustrating the prefix in question are:

- a) raġa’a “to return” > CIV ’arġa’a “cause to return” > subst. ’irġā’u “returning”
- b) hāfa [r. hwf] “to fear, be afraid” > CIV ’ahāfa “to frighten” > subst. ’ihāfa-tu “fright”.

Denominative CIV verbs usually express ‘declarative meaning’ combined with the idea denoted by the noun or adjective. e.g.

- a) θamaru “fruit” > ’aθmara “to bear fruit”.
- c) šitā’u “winter” > ’aštā “to winter” > subst. ’ištā’u.
- d) masā’u “evening” > ’amsā “to enter upon the time of evening” > subst. ’imsā’u “evening time”.
- e) ḥasanu “good” > ’aḥsana “be good to” > subst. ’iḥsānu “benevolence”

The prefix /'-/ becomes a part of the root in some of its occurrences in CA, Eth., and Aram. dialects, but in all of its occurrences in the remaining Hamito-Semitic languages.

1) A *misleading theory* built on a linguistic feature is a natural consequence of an erroneous or overhasty study of that feature. The story of inferences from inconclusive evidence always repeats itself in historical and comparative linguistics, and we know very well how it starts. The story goes as follows: *a scholar makes a conjecture about a linguistic feature and, afterward, later scholars adopt his point of view and treat it as a fact, forgetting quickly that the view is not based on any evidence from its very inception.* In so-doing, they transform the mere conjecture into a fact. The shocking tragedy here is that they all take pride in what they call ‘*scientific achievement or discovery*’.

For example, all Semitists are in accord that CA /'-/ does not belong to *Common Semitic*, a view flies in the face of the facts as we will see below. Moscati (1969: 126), for example, claims:

«*Developments in Aramaic and Arabic, together with the fact that prefixes h- and ’- are not found simultaneously in the various (Semitic) languages, suggest the possibility that both go back to one original theme whose prefix h- later became ’-.*».

O’Leary (1969: §138) considers all Semitic causative prefixes, including Phoen. y-, as developed from \*š/s, and the line of development is \*š/s > h > ’ > y. He also tends to derive \*š/s from an earlier \*ś. However, O’Leary does not explain how a sound like \*ś would change to /h/ ~ /’/. *Can this change take place by some abracadabra or magic charm?* One may possibly ask.

A similar view is held by Barton (1934: 22), who states:

*«In both groups of languages (Hamitic and Semitic) stems expressing causation are formed by prefixing the letter s, though in some of the Semitic languages this is thinned to h, as sometimes in Indo-European (compare the Sanskrit soma and the Persian haoma), and in others it is further thinned to ' (Aleph)».*

The same view was earlier expressed by Wright (1966: 204-207, first published in 1890), who entertained us with the following short and impressive story:

*«The factitive or causative conjugation of the verb seems originally to have been marked by a prefixed /ta/, taḳaṭala contracted to taḳtala... This form with t appeared to have had a sister form with prefixed š or sh. In Arabic this latter occurs in rare instances like سقلب “dash to the ground” (from ḳalaba), سلقى “throw down on the back” (whence the triliteral سلق slq), etc. The Himyaritic exhibits the s in one of its dialects... In Assyrian such forms as ušaškin “set up”, ušapriš “spread out”, ušašbit “let seize”, seem to be common... This initial s underwent, however, in most cases, a further change into h. Hence some rare Arabic forms like هراح “let rest”, هراق “pour out”, etc. This h does not occur in Ethiopic or Assyrian, but we find it in one of the Himyaritic dialects. In Biblical Aramaic it is common... In Syriac it is unknown; but it is the usual form in Hebrew...*

*The last step in the history of the factitive or causative is the weakening of the initial h into the spiritus lenis. In Phoenician the perfect is written with initial (y), but was probably pronounced iḳṭil. Examples from the inscriptions are יטנא “he set up” and וקדש “he consecrated”. This weakening is almost universal in Arabic... In Ethiopic too it is exceedingly common... In Hebrew it is very rare...; but in the Aramaic dialects it is the almost universal form».*

Semitists' theory rests on what they call 'fact' that /ʔ-/ is not found in other Semitic languages. This is, of course, a perfect example of surface and false fact. The deep fact, however, is that /ʔ-/ is as old in the family as /š-/, if it is not indeed much older, and that it is found in the entire Hamito-Semitic languages. As for /h-/, it is a mere variant of /ʔ-/, and so is its position in CA.

Another related false fact advanced by Semitists is that /š ~ s/ was thinned to /h/ and to /ʔ/, just as Skt. /s-/ is thinned to /h-/ in Persian. This fact has been termed false because no evidence in Semitic languages supporting it; in other words, I have never seen cognates in Semitic tending to sustain it. The correspondence between Skt. /s-/ and Pers. /h-/ in some cognate words has never been scientifically explained simply because the Indo-Europeanists, though they are much more sophisticated and talented than their disciples- the Semitists, have never touched the deep structure of any single Indo-European root, as we will witness in Chapter III.

2) The prefix under study is found in all Hamito-Semitic languages as an inseparable part of the root, a fact that may suggest that it is much older than caus. /š-/. In Egyptian



/ʾ-/ often appears as /y-/ . Gardiner (EG, 550) finds that:

«y, semivowel with two values /y/ and /ʾ/; often omitted in grammatical endings; tends to replace /ʾ/ or /r/».

He also adds:

«/ʾ/ and /r/ may be termed weak consonants, since they are very susceptible of change and omission; both tend to be replaced in writing by /y/» (p. 29).

The following are some illustrative examples of caus. /ʾ/ in Egyp.:

2a) Egyp. hʾi “to rise like the sun or like a king to his throne” (HED I, 534) > yhʾi “make to rise on a throne” (HED I, 77): CA hauʾu lit. “an overlooking white mountain between other mountains”, i.e. *higher than all other mountains* as in Poet. (Ruʾbah):

«kamā yalūḥu (ʾa)l hauʾu baina ʾal ʾaḡbāli» (Al Ayn II, 172; LA)

2b) Egyp. bs “to rise, advance” (HED I, 222) > ybs “make to rise, make to advance” (HED I, 40): CA bassa, CIV ʾabassa (§3.1.6.7, n. 7c, under *Comments*).

2c) Egyp. gr “be silent” (EHD II, 810) > ygr “make silent” (EHD I, 96). See (§2.2.56.4 above).

Egyp. dr “to destroy, expel, drive away, erase” (EHD II, 884) > ydr “to destroy, do away, remove” (EHD I, 103).

2d) Egyp. ḏry “strong” (EHD II, 910) (= CA ḏariya “become stronger”) > yḏr “make strong” (EHD I, 104).

2e) Egyp. pḥ “to arrive, attain to a place” (EHD I, 244) > ypḥ “make to arrive” (EHD I, 42).

2f) Egyp. mn “be stable, fixed, established, to remain”; mnw “firm” (EHD I, 296-297) > ymn “make firm, to establish” (EHD I, 54) = CA manna “to remain” also “be strong, firm”.

2g) Egyp. šm “to go” (EHD II, 739) > yšm “make to go” (EHD I, 92).

2h) Egyp. ʾsb “to burn, consume by fire”; ʾsbī “fire, flame” (EHD I, 9) is from \*šab- “to kindle; flame, fire” as in CA šabba “to burn, to kindle a fire”, etc. see §2.17.34 below.

2i) Egyp. ḵb (from ḵʾb) “to double” > yḵb id., orig. “make double” (EHD I, 93).

Further examination of Egyp. caus. \*ʾ- shows that caus. \*/ʾ-/ and \*/š-/ are sometimes used interchangeably, e.g. y-gr ~ s-gr “make silent”, and that the earlier presence of one single caus. \*ʾaš- from which both \*ʾa- and \*ša- have evolved should not be dismissed. Visible traces of this compound prefix are still seen in Egyp. and perh. in CA. Some examples are:

i) Egyp. ḥḏ “to shine” (EHD I, 90) ~ s-ḥḏ “to illumine” (EHD II, 685): ḥḏ “to shine, to illumine” (EHD I, 522).

ii) Egyp. ys-mn “to make firm, establish” (EHD I, 89) ~ s-mn “to establish, be established” (EHD II, 670): mn “be fixed, established”; mnw “firm, stable one” (EHD I, 296-297), etc. 2f above.

Besides Egyp., CA has few examples of a prefix /ʾs-/ in the Koran and pre-Islamic poetry as in the Koran: (فما استطاعوا أن يظهروه), where /ʾis-/ of ʾis-ṭāʾū “were able” is a prefix and the word is from [ṭwʾ] (for a discussion of this prefix, see Sibawayhi’s *Kitab* II, p. 429 and also LA). Similarly, PIP Adiyy Bin Zayd says:

«...wa mā 'iṣṭa'-ta min hairin linafsika fazdadi» (JAA, p. 396, L. 29).

Moreover, since the meaning of CA caus. /ʾ-/ , as will be demonstrated in §2.19.1, n. 5a below, is “*cause one*” (e.g. ʾasmaʿa “make one hear”, ʾaʿlama “make one learn”, ʾarġaʿa “make one or s.t. return”, etc.), it is most likely that \*ʾaš = pronominal *one* and also 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. pronoun. What may further support the establishment of both /ʾ-/ and /š-/ as being from an earlier compound \*ʾaš- is that the meaning of CA /ʾista-/ in CX {ʾistaFʿaLa} (see §2.1.7.3 above) is “*cause one + self*”, a compound of \*ʾas- plus \*-t “self”, e.g. ʾistamaʿa “make oneself hear”, ʾistaʿlama “make oneself inquire”, ʾistarġaʿa “make (oneself) retrieve”, and so on.

There is still one important issue to be raised in connection with the presence of the causative prefix /ʾ-/ in Aramaic dialects and its complete absence as a recognized causative in Old Aramaic. This is not a word a speaker of a language may avoid *using it if he wishes and use instead another synonymous word*. The /ʾ-/ is one of the most frequent and vital grammatical prefixes that no speaker of a language having the prefix can avoid using it. It is indeed an everyday prefix. Although the Koran includes only a very small portion of CA words, yet we rarely find a page of it free of this prefix and other affixes. The same holds true for pre-Islamic poetry. What I want to say is that the sudden appearance of this prefix in later Aramaic may be due to the influence of some Arabic dialects, e.g. of *Palmyrene* and *Nabataean* tribes long before they gave up their Arabic tongue to adopt the Aramaic language.

**2.3.1** Oakk. ʾšp “to add” (Gelb, 1961: 184), Assy. eṣēpu “to add, increase”; *Piel*. uṣṣip “to add to” (King, 1898: 331): PHS stem \*ḏap- in CA CI ḏāfa “to add”; CIV ʾadāfa “cause to add” > subst. ʾidāfa-tu “addition”; CVII ʾindāfa “be added to”. An expected variant with /-b/ is found in Akk.: cf. waṣābu(m) “ajouter” (DRS VII, 590).

**2.3.2** Akk. eṣēpu “to collect, gather”, Ug. ʾsp “to gather” (UG, 532), Phoen., Pun. ʾsp “to gather”, Phoen. nʾsph “gathering, assembly” (PG, 80; NWSI, I, 89 & II, 711), EHeb. ʾsp “to gather”; ʾāsīp “collection, ingathering of fruits”, Ez. 23, 16. 34, 22, Jp. ʾasap “to collect, gather” (OT, 73; DRS I, 27): PHS stem \*sap- in Akk. sepū “to tie”, CA CIV ʾasfafa or ʾasaffa, said of palm branches or fronds, “to bring together to make a basket or a (straw) mat”; saffa “to weave, plait”; saffīfu “girdle, belt”, Ge., Tna. sāfāyā “to sew”, Te., Har. sāfa, Amh., Arg. sāffa, etc. id.: Cush.: Kaffa šipp- “to plait, sew”, Gim. sif id., Gawwata šap- “to tie, sew” (HED, 137; HSED, n. 2312).

**2.3.3** Akk. abātu “to perish”, Assy. abātu “to destroy, disappear; annihilate” (King, 1898: 318), Ug. ʾbd “to perish” (UG, 534), OAram. ʾbd “to perish, be lost” (Rosenthal, AG, 9), BHeb. ʾābad “to perish, destroy”, Syr., Samar. ʾbd id. (OT, 3; Ryder, 1974: 102), OCan., Phoen., Moab., OffAram. Nab. ʾbd “to perish, go to ruin” (NWSI, I, 4), BAram. ʾbd “to perish, destroy” (Rosenthal, 1963: 76): PHS stem \*bad- “to perish” as in CA *bāda* “be perished, destroyed, to perish”; CIV ʾabāda “cause to perish, eradicate, destroy, annihilate”, also *baddada* “to waste away, to squander, scatter”; the underlying meaning here ‘make lose forever’ = Akk. badādu “to squander, waste, throw away”, Te. bādād bela “to scatter”.

For Moabite *’bd* “destruction, downfall, ruin” (NWSI, I, 5): CA *’ibāda*-tu fem. “annihilation, destruction”, the subst. of caus. *’abāda* above.

For Egyp. *yb’t-t’* “thou hast destroyed” (EHD I, 39): CA CIV *’abad-ta* or by assimilation *’abat-ta* id. The last cited form of CA, i.e. *’abat-ta*, is much more common.

**2.3.4** Akk. *agāru* “to hire”, CA *’aġġara* “to rent”; CX *’ista’ġara* “to hire”; *’uġra*-tu “wage, payment”; *’aġiru* “hired laborer” = Akk. *agru* id. (AG, 65), Ug. *’gr* “to hire”; *agr* “reward” (UG, 533, 535) = CA *’aġru* id., Palm. *’gr* “contract of lease” = CA *ġarrā*, CX *’istaġrā* “to appoint an agent; representative, deputy, agent”, hence *ġariyyu* “guarantor, security”, OffAram., Hatra., JAram. *’gr* “rent, wage, salary”, Nab., Syr. *’gr* “to hire”, BHeb. *’agōrā* “payment”, SAR *’gr* “paid servant”, Meh. *hougor* “servant”, Shh. *egor* “slave” (NWSI I, 11-12; DRS I, 7) = CA *’aġiru* “servant”. For the origin of [*’gr*], see §2.2.14 above.

1) Akk. *egirtu* “message, royal letter”, OAram. *’grt* (Rosenthal, AG, 8), Palm., Jp., OffAram., BAram., Palm., BHeb. *’grt* id. (DRS I, 7; NWSI I, 12; MD, 353): CA *ġariy* “messenger”. All are in all probability from a stem [*gar-*] “to run, go” (§§2.2.56.7; 2.11.71 below).

2) Akk. *ekkurū* “temple”, Aram. *’gr*, etc. Cohen *ibid.* = CA *ma-ġarru* “part of a house where major planks are placed (perh. to prop the roof or other planks)”; *’iġġaru* “a roof without a parapet along its edge”, pl. *’aġāġiru*, Akk. *igār* “wall, Syr. *’gr* “roof”, etc. (DRS I, 7), OffAram. *’gr*, JAram. *’grh* “wall” (NWSI I, 12). All are related to words for “roof” in §2.2.37 above.

**2.3.5** Akk. *edēlu* “fermer, se fermer”, Syr. *’ādlātā* pl. “battants de porte” (DRS I, 9), CA *’adala* “to close the door” are all plainly from PHS stem [*dal*] “door”, so called from *’hanging and swinging’* (see §2.2.7 above), as in Phoen., BHeb., JAram. *dlt* “door” (NWSI I, 250), Assy. *daltu* id., Ug. *dlt* “doorway” (UG, 532).

**2.3.6** Oakk. *’mr* “to see” (Gelb, 1961: 181), Ug. *’mr* “to see, be visible”, Ge. *’amara* “to show, indicate”; *’a’mara* “to know”; *t’mərt* “sign”, Tna. *’amāra* “to know”, Te. *’ammrārā* “be clear, well known”; *’amir* “acquaintance, knowledge”, Amh. *amro* “reason, intelligence” (DRS I, 24-25; Rabin, 1975: 89, n. 73), Assy. *amāru* “to see, find”; *tāmartu* “observation” (King, 1898: 321), Sab. *’mr* “sign” (SD, 6) = CA *’imārā*-tu, pl., id. Also belongs here, according to Cohen, CA *ta’ammala* “to examine”, but for this word, see §2.3.7 below. The triliteral is also found in Hamitic as in Berb. Kab. *məl* “montrer”, To. *aməl* “indiquer”, Cush.: Ag., Bil. *amar* “fair jour, clair”, *amari* “matin”, Sa., Af., Ga. *Aboro* “matin” (VPHS, 78, n. 9).

1) PHS stem *\*mar-* “to see” > “to know”, preserved, together with its original signification, in CA and in Egyp. *mr* “to see” and with prefixed caus. *š-*, in all Semitic languages (see §3.2.15 above). Concrete evidence derived from CA and Egyp., however, also confirms that PHS stem *\*mar-* is a compound word (see §2.10.11 below): PHS *\*’am-* or *\*ma’-* “to see > to know” (see §2.3.8 below).

**2.3.7** HS triliteral [*’mr*] also denotes “to order, command” as in CA *’amara* id., BHeb.

ʾāmar “to command” also “a matter, thing” = CA ʾamru “matter, thing, affair, concern” (OT, 66ff), EAram. ʾmr, Jp. ʾāmar, Syr. ʾemar, Mand. amar “to order, command” (DRS I, 23-24), EHeb., JAram. mʾmr “order, command” (NWSI II, 588): PHS stem \*ʾam- “to command, lead” (§2.3.8 below), again preserved in CA ʾamma “to lead, be in front”; ʾimāmu “leader, chieftain” (= ʾāmīru id.; ʾamīru “leader, chieftain, prince”; ʾamīru + the word for “sea” = “admiral”); ʾimma-tu “matter, affair, concern” (= ʾamru above): see below.

**2.3.8** A third signification of HS [ʾmr] is “to say, speak” as in, Phoen. ʾmr id., Pun. ʾmr “speech”, OAram., OffAram., Hatra, Palm., Nab. ʾmr “to say, speak” (NWSI I, 73ff), BHeb. ʾāmar “to say”, Syr. emar id., Ug. ʾmr “wish, speech”, Soq. ʾemor, Meh. amor “to say” (DRS I, 23-24; OT, 66ff). This notion is preserved in CA ʾāmara “to consult (with)” (§HH II, 582): Egyp. dʾ ʾm-t “to inform” (for caus. dʾ, see §2.1.6.5 above).

All are ultimately from PHS \*ʾam- ~ \*maʾ = Egyp. ʾmʾ “to see”, m “see, behold” (EHD I, 6, 266). There seems to be a close connection between “see; show” and “know”, hence the Egyp. cognate is ʾm “to know, understand”, Coptic. amo “to know” (EHD I, 6; Hodge, 1975: 180) = CA [ʾm] (with a variant [ʾm]), preserved intact in ʾimāmu perh. “what one learns; knowledge”; ʾumma-tu masc. “instructor, teacher” as in the Koran (16: 120): (إن إبراهيم كان أمة): cf. LA, Chad.: Tng yim- “to think”, Pero yim id., LPe wum “to teach”, Mubi ʾm “to see” (HSED, n. 1103). Here may belong Phoen., Pun. tmʾ “chief, commander”, orig. “overseer”

**2.3.9** CA CV taʾammala “to contemplate, examine, reflect on, meditate” also “look attentively on”, CI ʾamila “to expect” also “to hope, look forward to”; ʾamalu “hope”. The glottal stop /ʾ/ in such derivatives may be from a stem [ʾam-l] “to speak, think” as in CA CIV ʾamlā ~ ʾamlala “to say (something) for another to write”, OAram., OffAram. mll, JAram. ml “to speak”; OAram., OffAram. mlh, Hatra. mlt, JAram. mlyn, pl. “word” (NWSI II, 631f, 644f), BAram., Syr., BHeb. mlh “word, speech” (OT, 571), Cush.: Ga. malu “to think, suppose”, Som. malee id. (Zaborski, 1975: 323).

**2.3.10** Akk. agappu, gappu “wing”, BAram. ʾgp, gp, NHeb. gāp id., etc. (DRS I, 7). In BHeb. ʾgp pl. is found only in *Ezekiel* and expresses “hosts, armies” (OT, 12), perh. orig. “wing of an army” like CA ḡuffu “hosts” as in the PIP of Nābiyah:

«...fī ḡuffī Tayliba wāridī (ʾa)l ʾamrāri».

The word also means “wing or side”. *Uthman*, the 3rd Islamic Caliph, says:

«mā kuntu liʾadaʾa (ʾa)l muslimīna baina ḡuffayni yaḏribu baʾḏuhum riḡāba baʾḏin» = *Certainly, I was not going to leave the Moslems between two (opposing) wings (of their own army), with each (wing) beheading the other*, where ḡuffa-yni [ḡf], dual, “two wings”.

The root [gp] is still seen in CA ḡanafa “to recline on one side”, from ḡaffa, where the first /-f-/ dissimilates to /-n-/. For dissimilation, see §2.17.80 below.

M. Cohen (VPHS, 79, n. 13) considers Heb. and Aram. words as borrowed from Akk. without explaining his choice, and connects the Akk. word with Egyp. ygp “nuage”, Berb.

agafay, agayaf "vent humide", etc. Apparently, he did not include the CA word simply because he, like all other Semitists, does not know that CA [ḡf] = "wing, side".

Egy. ygp also expresses "rain storm, fog, mist" and, like ygb, "flood", and is from yg "flood, stream" > yg'p "flood, rainstorm" > ygp above: \*g'p > gp "flood, storm, inundation"; as a vb. "to flood, to rain". Its initial /y-/ (= Semitic /'-/) is a prefix.

#### Comments

a) Another HS term for "wing" is [knp] as in Ug. knp id. (UG, 537), BHeb. kānāp id., CA kanafu "wing; side", Akk. kappu, Eth. knf, BAram., Syr., knp, Mand. kanpa id. (OT, 478; MD, 199), Sab. knf "side, border" (SD, 78), OAram. knp "fringe" (AG, 4), Cush.: Bil. kanfi "wing", Xamta kenfaa, Kwara kamb, Kemant kämbii id. (HSED, n, 1426), Chad.: Sura cáap "Flügel", Tera kopa-x id. (Müller, 1975: 64, n. 11). The term is seen without /-n-/ (or with /-n-/ being assimilated to the following /-p/) in Assy. kappu "wing"; kippāti pl. "the ends (of heaven and earth)" (King, 1898: 354) = CA kifāfu pl. of kuffa-tu "side, end".

The word *kappu* is also the term for "(palm of the) hand" in HS languages as in Akk. kappu, OAram. kp "hand", CA kappu, Ug. kp "palm of the hand", etc., Egypt. kp "hollow of the hand or foot" (EHD II, 793)<sup>79</sup>. The /-n-/ of [knp] is an infix (see §2.11 below), precisely like /-t-/ in Sem. [ktf] "shoulder", and that \*gp and \*kp are variants of one single proot.

b) The most widely used term for "side" in CA is *ḡanbu*, with infixed /-n-/; Sab. gnb "be beside s.o." (SD, 50) = CA bi (= by) ḡānib id. The same trilateral is also seen without /-n-/ as in OffAram. gb' "side" (NWSI I, 207), BAram. gab id. = CA ḡuba' "tip (or end) of a horn". Other variants are Syr. gabba "side", JAram. gyp id., Ge. gabō [gbw] "side", Cush.: Agaw, Bil. gabā "side", Bil. gaf "side of the body", Ga. gamā "side", Som. gon(b), pl. guman; gebi "bank", Bil. gaf "side", Xamir gəba id., Bambala gaba "side", Bed gāb, geb "side", Housa gāḡa "bank" (VPHS, 121, n. 216; HSED, n. 856).

c) Though the time is not sufficiently ripe and convenient to reconsider the phonological system of both Proto-Semitic and Proto-Hamito-Semitic, yet it seems evident to me that the phonemic system of Proto-Hamito-Semitic did not have all the customary consonant phonemes ascribed to it. The reason for bringing up this topic is not because the traditional phonemic system with its large numbers of consonant phonemes is *at war with the law of nature and law of evolution*, nor is it due to the observation that \*gpp ~ kpp ~ gnp ~ gnb, etc. denote the same sort of meaning. The real reason is solely based on *my ability to predict* that most true minimal pairs of roots whose phonetic difference lies in the feature [voice or emphatic] would in most cases express the same deepest meaning. *This phenomenon may suggest that [voice] as a distinctive feature is a later development in early PHS. Similarly, the feature 'emphatic' also seems to be a later development.*

*Conversely, the same phenomenon may also suggest, as far as 'voice' is concerned, that early PHS had had some phonemes, which were later coalesced with other*

<sup>79</sup> To express 'hollow s.t.' in CA, one may use CII ḡauwafa or kauwafa with a slight difference in meaning.

phonemes. Suppose, for instance, that early PHS had a glottalized \*b' or voiced uvular \*q, the later fate of these sounds in PHS would be to merge with labials or with velars and voiceless uvular [k] respectively<sup>80</sup>.

**2.3.11** Akk. apāl “be late, tarry”, Talm. 'apal “to obscure, darken” (DRS I, 29), OAram. 'pl “late born lamb” (NWSI I, 98), BHeb. 'āpēl “darken (of the day)”; 'ōpel “darkness, gloom”, CA 'afala, said of the sun, “to set, sink, submerge, disappear” also “to fail, be weak”, esp. of plants, *to be late, of slow growth*; 'ufūlu (from CIV pass. 'ufīla) “disappearance or setting of the sun” (OT, 78): PHS stem [pal] “to fall” > “set (of the sun) > be dark > late”. The stem is also seen in §§2.2.21 above and 2.11.28 below.

a) To PHS \*pal- certainly belong Akk. apl “son, heir” = CA 'apīlu lit. “son of camel” also “weaned animal”; 'afala “be pregnant” (LA, r. 'fl), but this latter meaning is also expressed by falwu “foal” with falā “to wean” also “to raise or bring up a child”; 'iftalā id. as in Poet.

«... 'iftalainā ḡulāman saidan fīnā» (ṢḤḤ VI, 2457).

b) Akk. and CA words may be compared with CA nāfila(h) “son’s son” (Al 'ayn VIII, 325) also “master” (LA). This same /n-/ is also seen in a number of words having to do with the same or similar idea: cf. CA naḡlu “son”: [ḡal] “majesty, sublimity”; naslu “offspring, children”: [sul] “family, race”, (§3.17.14 below), etc. A possible meaning of \*n- here is “descendant of”: cf. Pun. nn “descendant” (NWSI, II, 734), derived from \*n- “belonging to” (cf. Egyp. n id.: EG, 571). As a matter of fact, the notion ‘*belonging to*’ as expressed by the genitive [n] or [y] actually extends to “coming from, derived from, taking from, descendant of, etc.”

c) Apart from the orig. of /n-/, which is ultimately identical with HS \*n- of [npl] (§2.11.28 below), notions like ‘*miscarry*’, ‘*abortion*’, ‘*fetus*’ and sometimes ‘(grand) son, child’ are, among many other notions, derived from “fall, cast forth”. We have already drawn attention to this fact (cf. §2.2.21 above, also see §2.11.22 below). Some additional examples are: CA 'asaḡaṡa-t, ṡaraḡa-t “to miscarry” are from saḡaṡa “to fall” and ṡaraḡa “throw, or cast, away” respectively.

**2.3.12** Ug. 'šr “joy”, Pun. 'šr id., BHeb. 'iššer “make happy, blessed”; 'ōšer “happiness”; 'ēšer “happiness, blessedness, safety” (DRS, I, 35; OT, 97ff), also BHeb. bə-'āšrī (Gen. 30, 13: OT ibid.) “with my happiness” = CA bi-surūrī lit. id., CIV 'asarra “make happy”, CA 'ašaru “joy, exultation” (Al 'Ayn VI, 284): PHS stem \*šar- “be happy; happiness, welfare” as in 'asarra CIV of [sar] “to make happy, please”, surra “be happy”; surūru “joy, delight, happiness, pleasure”; sarrā'u “prosperity, welfare”, Tham. sr “joy, delight” (Branden, 1950, 516). For the Egyp. cognate of \*šar-, see §2.10.8, n. b below.

a) CA sursūru, with reduplication, “sagacious, well-informed (man)”, in a phrase,

<sup>80</sup> To the list of words signifying “*side* or *wing*” above, I can add \*ḡaf “wing”, preserved in the dual form ḡafḡafā “two wings”, as a vb ḡafḡafa, said of a bird, “to warm and protect the eggs by covering them with the wings”, preserved in SL in 'aff (i.e. ḡaffa), said of a hen, “to lower its wings (i.e. *bring them back to their normal position*), lower its body toward the ground, and stop moving”. This also the position it adopts, together with other birds, to enable the cock to be atop of it (in mating).

with *māl* = money, “a frugal person who knows his interest and how to safeguard it” (LA, r. srr), Phoen. *srsr* “broker” (NWSI, II, 804).

b) To PHS \**šar-* also belong, with prefixed *y-*, CA *yusru* “ease, prosperity, affluence, wealth” (for initial /y-/, see §2.6) and with perh. prefixed *ʿ-*, its expected antonym *ʿusru*<sup>81</sup>. Both *yusru* and *ʿusru* occur in this Koranic verse (94:6): (إن مع العسر يسرا).

c) Amh., Arg. *sarrärä* “to mount (male atop of female), jump”, Ge., Tna. *särärä* “to mount”, Te. *särra* “to jump”, Har. *särära* “to mount (male on female)” = CA *ta-sarra* “to have sexual intercourse”; *sirru* “penis”; *surri-yatu* “concubine”; *saṛīru* “bed”. Such derivatives seem to belong to a different proot.

d) Sab. *srr* “cultivated land beside flood-bed” also “valley” (SD, 128) = CA *saṛāru* “the most fertile land”, *sirru*, pl. *surūru* ~ *ʿasirra-tu* “middle of a valley and the most fertile place of it” as in the PIP of Labid:

«*ʿasirratu* *raiḥānin*, *bi-ḳāʿin* *mu-nauwiri*»

«*ḥadāʾika* *mauliyyi* (ʿa)l *ʿasirradi* *ʿayaidi*».

**2.3.13** Akk. *apāru* “to cover the head”, Ge. *ʿafar*, Amh. *afar* “dust” (DRS I, 30), BHeb. *ʾāpar* “to cover”, *ʾāpēr* “a covering of the head, head-band, turban”; *ʾēper* “ashes” (OT, 80).

CA trilateral [ʾfr] denotes the following:

1. *ʾafara* “to run and leap or jump, to run fast, be swift”: PHS stem \**par-* “to go, run, fly” as in CA *farra* “to flee”; *farfara*, with reduplication, “to hasten, hurry up” and “to fly”, Ug. *pr̥r id.* (UG, 532), etc., PChad. \**p-r-* “to fly, leap” (Carnochan, 1975: 463). See §2.2.16 above and §2.11.72 below.

2. *ʾafara* “to boil to such an extent that the boiling water jumps out the pot” (see n. 6 below), as in poet.:

«*bāhū wa ḳidru* (ʿa)l *ḥarbi ta-ḡlī ʾafarā*» (Al ʿayn VIII, 282).

PHS stem \**par-* “to swell, rise, boil”. For its cognates in Semitic languages, see §2.11.43 below.

3. *ʾufra-tu* “beginning” also “(beginning to) become intense”, used with terms like ‘summer, winter, heat’, etc. = *furra-tu id.* The word *ʾufra-tu* (-tu = fem. suffix) is from a pass. \**ʾufra*, which I have never seen in all CA literature. All are from PHS stem \**pur-* or \**par-* “first” as in CA *furra-tu* “the best of, beginning”. This same meaning is also expressed by several Semitic trilaterals beginning with \**pr-*, one of which is [prʿ] “first”; another is [frd] “individual, one, unique”, etc.

4. The initial /ʾ/ in the words cited in 1 & 2 above is orig. the caus. /ʾ-/ forming CIV verbs and substances. The word *ʾufra-tu* (in 3 above), however, could be from *ʾufra-tu*, a compound of \**ʾu-* “great, grand, or first, i.e. one” (see §3.14 below) and a stem \**pur*.

5. The CA exact cognate form of Akk. and BHeb. words above with which Semitists have not been familiar is \**par-* as in *farra* “to uncover”. Omar, *the 2<sup>nd</sup> Islamic Caliph*,

<sup>81</sup> It is amazing that some derivatives of [ysr] and [ʿsr] have to do with “the left (hand)”: *yusrā* “the left (hand)” as opposed to *yumnā* “the right hand” and *ʿa-ʿsar* “left-handed” (Al ʿAyn I, 326) = SL *yasār* “left”, *ʿisrēwī* “left handed”. This particular proot [ʿW-] will be explained and illustrated in §3.14 below. Apart from all meanings expressed by [sar], there is still an important one having to do with ‘line’.

said to Ibin Abbās: «*kān yabluḡunī 'anka 'ašyā'u karihtu 'an 'afurra-ka 'anhā*» (LA); *farra*, said of a beast of burden or horse “to uncover the teeth in order to determine the age of the animal by looking at them”: PHS stem [par] “to uncover, show, see”. This same PHS stem is seen in all Semitic languages with caus. \*š- (see §2.2.17 above).

As for Akk. & BHeb. 'pr “to cover”, its initial \*'a- is definitely from PHS \*'a- “not, no” (see §2.21.1 below). For Eth. 'fr “dust” (also BHeb. 'apēr “ashes”), its initial /'-/ is from /'-/; cf. CA 'afru “dust”, OCan., BHeb., OffAram. 'pr id. (NWSI II, 879).

We may conclude that CA [ʾfr] and Akk.-Hebr. [ʾpr] are false surface cognates, but that they share in common an ultimate deep structure “to uncover, to show”, esp. ‘the head’ in Akk.-Heb. but ‘the whole face, including the head’ in CA. CA also insists on expressing this same meaning in [sfr] (§2.2.17 above).

It is possible that “*uncover the teeth*” meant orig. “open the mouth or part the lips”. In following this possibility, the stem may be analyzed as a compound of [faʾ] “apart” and \*-r “mouth”, and the orig. signification is “*open the mouth*”.

6. In going back to par- < paw in (2) above to furnish evidence supporting my view, we find that fāra, said of a pot, “to boil and rise what is in it of food, water, etc.”. In poet. “to kindle a fire, burn” as in

«...iḏā radda 'āfi (ʾa)l qidr man yasta'iruhā  
wa kānū ḡu'ūdan ḡaulahā yarḡubūnahā  
wa kānat fatātu (ʾa)l ḡaiyī mimman yu-fīru-hā» (LA, r. fwr).

Other derivatives are faura-tu “fervid heat, rage, fury”; fuwwāra-tu “foam of a boiling pot”, Mand. pura “rage, passion, heat, fury” (MD, 368). Gesenius (OT, 832) considers Heb [bʾr] “to burn” as cognate. We will come back to this view below.

7. With interchange of /w/ and /ʾ/: CA faʾīra-tu fem. “a kind of food cooked on a fire and when it is about to boil, it is taken away and filtered”; faʾra-tu “a swelling in the ankle of a beast of burden”. As we know, Semitic [pʾr] is the triliteral from which the term for ‘mouse’ is also derived: CA faʾru masc.; faʾra-tu fem., BHeb. pērāh for pəʾērāh (OT, 832), Akk. pirurūtu (Cohen, 1969: 167), Har. fūr ~ fuʾur, E., Gt., M., Ms. fur, En., Ed. fuʾur, etc. “mouse, rat” (HED, 63), Chad.: Housa ḡera “mouse, rat” (HSED, n. 1913). The Akk. fem. term is most likely formed from the masc. *fuʾrūru*, an arch. term found in CA. The root vowel may be /-i-/ as in Akk., and is seen in CA firnibu, perh. “a young of rat or mouse” ~ mirnibu “big rat with short tail”, perh. from *maran* “inner muscles of upper arm”.

8. It seems to me that there is a very close semantic relationship between ‘mouse’ and ‘muscles’, i.e. ‘swell’, from the resemblance between the muscle of upper arm and a mouse. The most common CA word for “muscles” is ʾaḡalu, which is also the term for “rat”. The most common CA word for “rat” is ḡurḡu (= Egyp. grt id.: cf. EHD II, 809), hence ḡaraḡa, said only of the muscles of hamstring, sole of the foot, etc. of a beast of burden, horse, “to swell”, mirnabu “rat; mouse” from [mrn] “tendons of the arm”, fn “swelling of the elbow” = Egyp. pn “mouse”, etc.

9. In returning to \*par- < \*paw- (n. 6 above), we find that the ultimate BHeb. cognate form of CA [fwr] is pāʾrūr, pārūr “heat, pot for cooking” (OT, 833, 865). The same CA word also expresses “flesh (perh. orig. ‘muscles’) of the back”.

As for BHeb. [bʾr] (n. 6 above) also Ug. bʾr “to burn”, etc. (§2.13.30 below), it is



cognate with CA s'r (§2.2.56.3 above). This linguistic phenomenon has already been explained in §2.1.13, n. 3 above. For initial proot [b-], see §2.13 below.

**2.3.14** BHeb. 'umlal "to languish, droop; languid, feeble" (OT, 64), Pun. 'ml "to wither"; caus. y'ml (NWSI, I, 71): PHS \*mal- as in CA 'amalla "to exhaust, tire out, emaciate", the caus. form of malala or malla "be/become bored, tired". It is interesting to note that Pun. y'ml contains two causative prefixes: y- (§2.6 below) and /'-/.

**2.3.15** BHeb. 'āšar "to go straight forward" (OT, 97): CA sāra "to walk, to go forward to an intended place", hence saiyāra-tu "caravan" (nowadays 'car' in all forms of Arabic), SA: Meh. seyōr "to go", Chad.: Sura sor "to go", Migama saraw "to arrive", etc. (HSED, n. 2203). The biliteral is also seen with prefixed /m-/ , /'-/ , and /y-/ (see §2.10.8 below).

**2.3.16** CA 'fz "to leap, be agile, light", Talm. 'pz "to leap, dance", Mand. aupiz "to leap, dance" (DRS I, 28; MD, 30): PHS word \*paz- "to leap" as in CA fazza id., BHeb. pzz "to leap up" (Ryder, 1974: 115; OT, 840). The biliteral is also seen with prefixed n-, w-, etc. see §§2.11.74, 3.12.22, 2.17.70, and 2.17.83.4 below.

**2.3.17** CA CII 'annaba "to scold and blame" < nabā "to disagree with, oppose, push away". To nabā /w-/ is also added to form an additional triliteral [wnb] = ['nb] in meaning.

**2.3.18** CA 'aniḡa "to admire, love", e.g. *a person because he is neat, handsome, pleasant, elegant*, etc.; 'ināḡa-tu "charm, beauty, elegance"; 'anīḡu "nice, elegant, neat, tidy" < CA naḡiy "clean, pure", EHeb., OffAram., JAram. nḡy "pure", "to clean, clear" (= CA naḡḡā id.), OffAram. nḡyh "purification, libation", etc. (NWSI II, 756-758), OAkk. nḡ' "to libate" (Gelb, 1961: 180): see §2.11.51 below.

**2.3.19** CA 'ismu "name", OAram. 'šm besides šm id. (Dupont-Sommer, AG. 2): PHS stem [šum] "name" as in Akk. šumu, Ug., BHeb. šm, Sab. sm, Eth. sem id. (Rabin, 1975: 88), PChad. \*s-m- "name" (Carnochan, 1975: 464): CA ta-smiya-tu "naming": sammā "to name" (Koran: 3:36, 13:33, etc.). We have already demonstrated (cf. §2.2.48, n. 2h above) that the biradical is a compound of \*š- and \*-m. It is most likely that [-m] is a prep. signifying "on" (see 2.10 below).

Initial /'-/ was recognized by old Arab scholars as a prefix and grammatically termed 'Alef waṣṭl'. It serves as a *connective* or *conjunctive* element (Ṣahibi, 103-104; LA r. 'ns).

**2.3.20** BHeb. 'lm in Gen. 37.7 "to bind (into sheaves)" (Ryder, 1974: 97) = CA CII lamma "to assemble, collect": PHS stem [lam], also seen in BHeb., with its own caus. h- (see §2.4 below), hālam "to assemble, bring together" (§2.18 below below).

**2.3.21** BHeb. 'bl "a grassy place, pasture", Syr. 'bl "grass", CA 'abala, 'abila "be moist,

wet (esp. ‘grass’); ‘aballa “to rain” (OT, 7): PHS stem \*bal- “moist, wet” as in BHeb. bālāl “to pour over, oint, wet all over”, Syr. blbl “to sprinkle” (OT, 136), CA balla “be moist, wet” (= ‘abila above); CIV ‘aballa “make moist, wet”, etc. §2.24.10. To this proot also belongs CA [wbl] as in wabala “to rain copiously”, BHeb. yābāl “stream, river” (OT, 372). For prefixed /w-/, see §§2.10.27 & 2.12.50 below.

**2.3.22** Akk. abbālu “be sad, mournful”, Ug. \*’abl “mournful person”, BHeb. ’ābal “to mourn”, Syr. ’ebal, Jp. ’abel id., Man. ōbel “be afflicted”, Te. hēbal “funeral songs” (DRS I, 3; NWSI I, 5), CA ’abbala “to mourn, eulogize a dead person” ~ ’abbana id. Since [’bn] is unproductive, it can be said that /-n/ is variant of /-l/: PHS stem [bal] “to perish, die out” as in Akk. belū, balū “to die out, disappear”, Assy. balū “to fade, to go to ruin, not to be” (King, 1898: 338), Ug. bly “worn out”, Aram. belā “to perish, be worn out, be old”, CA baliya “be worn out, to decay, perish”; ’ibtalā “be afflicted”, balwa-tu “calamity”, BHeb. bālā “to decay, wax old, be worn out” (DRS II, 66; OT, 134f), BAram. blh “to wear out” (Rosenthal, 1963:79). PHS stem [bal] is also seen with prefixed n- (§2.11.13 below).

**2.3.23** Akk. adamm- “rouge”, Ge. ’adīm “red skin” (DRS I, 9), Ug. ’dm “to rouge” (Hoffner, UG. 535), CA ’adīmu, perh. from \*’ad-W(y or w)-m “red hide or skin, tanned red leather or skin” also “the *face* of the earth (i.e. lit. ‘(upper) *skin* of earth’)”, after the color of the earth or more specifically ‘soil’, BHeb. ’dm “be red, ruddy” also “a tanned skin, earth” (OT, 14f; Ryder, 1974: 97), Phoen. ’dm, Pun. ’dmh “red” (NWSI I, 14f), Cush.: Som. idm “peau de chèvre tannée”, Ga. ’anada, by metathesis, id. (VPHS, 79, n. 15), and without /-m/: Afar adday “hide”, Bed. ada “skin, hide”. All are related to PHS stem [damu] “blood, red” as in Akk., CA damu “blood”, BHeb. dām id., Eth. dam, Aram. dm id. (Gray, 1971: 15), Ug. dm id. (UG, 531), also CA dammu “blood relationship”; damma “to make red, paint or overlay with a red color”; madmūmu “red”, with y-ext.: CA CII dammā “to bleed”; mudmā, said of anything, “red”.

The orig. signification of PHS stem \*dam- is “earth” (§2.3.24 below) > “color of the earth, i.e. “red, ruddy”, much later “blood”. The earliest possible meaning of the stem is “hide, skin” + \*-m: see §2.2.24 below.

**2.3.24** BHeb. ’dm “earth, land, region, country” (’admā “name of a city”) (OT, 15), CA ’adama-tu “soil, face of the earth”; ’īdāmatu “solid land without stones, flat land, fine hill” (’adāmu “name of a town, ’admā id., etc.), Akk. adnatu (\*admatu) “piece of land”, Pun. ’dmt, pl., “land, country”, Aram. ’adamtā (DRS I, 9; NWSI I, 14-15), OAram. ’dm “place-name” (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 1). All are from PHS \*dim-, related to PHS stem \*dam- above (§2.3.25 above), as in CA dumādīmu, with reduplication, “fine or uncoarse hill”; dimma-tu “enclosure, pen”, damdama lit. “stick or glue anything to the ground and spread it”, Akk. dim-t- “tour, district”, Ug. dmt “tour” (VPHS, 269), Chad.: Tangel tōm “country”, Tera dam “field”, Ngwahi dama “place”, Mokilko doome “field” (HSED, n. 16): see §2.2.25 below.

**2.3.25** Akk. admānu “palace” is connected by Cohen (DRS I, 9) with BHeb. ’armōn id.

According to Gesenius (OT, 88), the BHeb. word signifies “fortress, castle, citadel, palace”, so-called from its height. BHeb. also has *harmōn* “fortress, castle”, from \**hrm* “be high” = CA *hrm* “be great, to lift up”, hence *haramu* “pyramid, lofty building” (OT, 263) ~ [*’rm*] below.

1) There seems to be a trilateral [*’rm*] in Hamito-Semitic as in Akk. *’arammu* “dam”, Berb: Ahg *arrem* “town, village”, Chad.: Bokkos *ram* “land, place”, Sha, Kulere *ram* “town, village”, (HSED, n. 53), CA *’iramu* “a kind of primitive minaret, memorial stone” also “mountain”; *’urramu* pl. “stone”; *’iram*, *name of the city of the extinct tribe of ’Ad* as in the Koran: (إرم ذات العماد), *Irama with tall statues* (89: 7); *’irmiy* “dweller, inhabitant”, a compound of \**’rm* “to dwell; a dwelling” and [-y] “belonging to” as in the negative sentence «*wa mā biddāri ’irmiy*» “There is no one in the house”: *wa* “and”, *mā* “not”, *bi* “in”, *ddāri*, from *’al dāri*, “the house”, *’irm-* “dwelling”, -y “belonging to” (Al ’Ayn VIII, 296; LA). The original meaning of *’irm-iy* is thus “(one) belonging to the dwelling or house”.

1) Akk. *admānu* “palace” is from PHS stem \**dum-* “house; to dwell”, seen in Egyp. *dmy*, *dmyi*, *dmi* “town, village”, *dmy’* “fortress” (i.e. house + great), *dm* “enclosure” Akk. *dima-tu* “tower, district”, Ug. *dm* “to dwell”; *dm-t* “borough”, CA *dimma-tu* “enclosure, pen” (§2.3.24 above), Assy. *dimmu* “obelisk, column”: Chad.: Sumray *dam*, Sibine *dama* “to dwell, live, sit”, Boghom *tam* “to dwell”, Geji *dām* “to sit”; dem-owi “to dwell” (EHD II, 878f; HSED, n. 643, 709; King, 1898: 344), with n-ext.: CA *dima-nu*, pl., “traces in a place indicating that people and their cattle were once living in it”, hence “manure, dung, anything indicating that people and their cattle were living in a place” as in the PIP of Labīd:

«*dimanun tağarrama ba’da ’ahdi ’anīsihā*

*ḥiḡaḡun ḥalauna ḥalāluhā wa ḥarāmuhā*» (DL, p. 164, L. 1);

*dimna-tu* “land near or round a house”. LA [r. *dmn*] states that it is said «*dammana fulānu finā’a fulān ta-dmīna*, i.e. *’iḏā yaṣīyahu wa lazimahu*»: *dammana* means “to come to or enter into (the front/entrance of a house = *finā’a*, in related languages ‘face, turn’) and stay in it”, i.e. *dwel*; *Dammūn*, place-name, occurred in the PIP of Imri’ Al Qais:

«*taṭāwala (’a)l lailu ’alain dammūn...*» (DI, p. 188, L. 1).

Eth.: Te. *dimnāt* “abandoned camp, ruins” (DRS IV, 274) = CA *dimnatu* fem., sg. id.

The stem is also seen with other extensions as with *š-ext.*: Akk. *damāšu* “couvrir” with *dumšu* “toit”, Ge. *damsa* “sombre”; *damasa* “couvrir, cacher”, CA *damasa* “be dark, to cover, to hide”; *dimāsu* “bathroom, dungeon” (also, perh. = *kinnu*, i.e. “house”), Syr. *dumsā* “house”, etc. (VPHS, 275, 277), and so forth. The stem is also seen in many Semitic names of cities and villages such as *Tu-dmuru* or *Ta-dmuru* “Palmyra”, *Dummaru* (both in Syria), *Dammām* (Saudi Arabia), *dimašḡ* “Damascus”, among many others.

2) We have to digress for a while to bring to light an interesting linguistic feature noted in CA that may help elucidate some aspects of the root under discussion. We have just assumed that the earlier meaning of CA *’irmiy* is “dweller”, i.e. (one) *belonging to the dwelling/house or ’iramu*. The evidence I have here is simply based on my observation of the pattern of the negative sentence «*wa mā biddār...*» above. The blank,

filled above with *'irmiy*, can also be filled with several specific words, derived from terms for “house”, without any change in meaning. Among such words are: (a) *ṭū'iy* (LA, r. [ṭwy], with a variant *ṭu'wiy* in old Tamīm dial. (for this, see LA, r. [ṭ']), (b) *dūriy* or *daiyāru* (LA, r. [dwr]), (c) *'ainu* or *'aiyinun* (LA, r. [ʾyn]), (d) *ṭūriy* or *ṭūrāniy* (LA, r. [ṭwr]), (e) *tūmuriy* (LA, r. [tmr]), etc. As we have just mentioned, all such words and many others are derived from existing terms for different types of “house” in the language. They are respectively:

3a) *ṭiyya-tu* [r. ṭwy] “the house you intend to live in”, perh. Chad.: Fyer taw “roof”, Warji ṭuwai id., Egyp. tw'-t “roof” (HSED, n. 2466).

3b) *dāru* is a cover term for “house + land surrounds it + people live in it”, in Akk. “fortress, wall”, etc. §2.1.14.2, n. 2 above.

3c) *ma-'ānu* “house”; *'a'yānu* “household” (nowadays *'a'yānu* expresses in MSA and dialects only “magnates, worthies” with no singular form) = BHeb. *m'n* “a habitation, dwelling” (OT, 595, in CA ‘a city or town name’), Sab. *m'n* “dwelling” (SD, 23), Eth.: Har. *ona* “abandoned house”, Te. *'ona* “remains of the abandoned or destroyed house”, Cush.: Ga. *ona* “uninhabited house” (HED, 27).

3d) *ṭaura-tu*, pl. “building”, BHeb. *ṭwr* “a wall round about, an enclosure”, in Aram “wall, mountain” (§2.1.14.2, n. 2, under *Comments* above).

3e) *tāmūru* “a hermit’s habitation or dwelling”, in BHeb. *tamar* “place-name” (OT, 1109).

4) In going back to *\*dum-* “house”, we find that the stem is also seen as *dūm-* [r. *dwm*] in a CA quasi-compound *dūma-tu* *'al-ḡandali* “fortress, stronghold”, which consists of *dūma-tu*, fem., “structure” and *'al-ḡandali* “the stones”, i.e. “a structure or house built with stone” (ŠḤḤ V, p. 1923; LA r. *dwm*). The word appears in BHeb. as *Dumah* Gen. 25,14 and refers to «a tribe and district of Ishmaelite (= Arabs) in Arabia» (OT, 218), Ug. *dm* “to dwell”, Chad.: Boghom *tam* “to dwell”, Geji *dəm* “to sit”, Sumray *dam*, Sibine *dama* “to dwell, live, sit” (HSED, 148).

5) A variant of *\*dum-* “house” is perhaps Akk. *atmanu* “palace, temple”, CA *'uṭumu* “fortress” (DRS I, 16), pl. *'uṭūmu* or *'āṭāmu* as in the PIP of Imri' Al Qais:

«...wa lā *'uṭuman* *'illa mašīdan bi-ḡandali*» (DI, p. 19, L. 5).

Otherwise, PSem. *\*'ṭm* is from *\*ṭam-* as in Akk. *ṭammumu* “to close up”, CA *ṭamma* “to conceal, bury, cover, close”, Egyp. *tm* “to hide, close”, etc. (§2.1.9.5, n. a above), with prefixed *'-*: CA *'aṭima* “to cover a window with a curtain”, BHeb. *'āṭam* “to shut, to close” (OT, 39). In both BHeb. and CA the prefix *'-/* is obviously caus.

6) On the Etymology of *Damascus* (as in Akk. *dimaški*, CA *dimašku*, Egyp. *Ta-ms-ku*, Amarna *du-ma-aš-ka* (pl. n.), BHeb. *dammešek*). Shehadeh writes:

*«The problem encountered here is not the representation of the sibilant but the etymology of the name. Scholars, so far, have been unanimous in regarding this name as consisting of two elements: dū/ī and maška. Whereas dū/ī is regarded by most as the relative/demonstrative pronoun, \*dū/ī, the interpretation of maška varied from “chalky clay” and “cup-bearer” to “pertaining to watered terrain; well watered”... There is, however, one very important point they all seem to have overlooked, namely that*

*since this name occurs in fifteenth century Egyptian inscription (Tuthmosis III) as Ta-ms-ḳu (and not Da-ms-ḳu or Ta-ms-ḳu), and, since it appears in Amarna written with the signs du/i and ti, the first radical could hardly be the equivalent of Proto-Semitic \*ḏ».*

Let us suppose, as scholars believe, that the name is a compound of \*ḏū/ī plus \*mašḳ- ~ \*mašḳ- “watered” (CA mašḳiy id.), then its first element should have appeared in Akk., BHeb., etc. as \*zū/-ī. This fact alone proves that the initial dental stop is not from a voiced interdental fricative, and that the unanimous agreement of scholars in the quotation above must therefore be rejected at once.

7) A different opinion is expressed by old Arab scholars, who consider the term as derived from *damšaḳu* “swift and speedy” (§2.1.6.5 above), hence *dimašḳu* “Damascus” is from “*built in haste*”.

On the other hand, Azhari says: it is said ḡamalun (= camel) *dawšaḳu*, if it is ‘big; great’; but if the camel is *quick*, it is said *damšaḳu*. The term *dawšaḳu* also expresses in the language “a large (or huge) house”. Suppose that the analysis given here is correct, the word is a compound of \*daw- “house” plus šaḳ- “tall/long” (cf. CA ‘a-šaḳḳu “tall/long”), and the original meaning of the compound would be “long/tall/far-stretched house”, i.e. *a large (huge) house or structure*.

8) There is no denying that \*daw- is a later term for “house”, ultimately derived from ‘a type of place’ as in Berb. -dā “place”, Chad. Sha. dā id., Ngizim dā “town”, Sok. dā “house”, Bura, Ngwahi di “town”, etc. (HSED, n. 592) = CA *daw-šaḳ-* above, etc. see §2.1.6.5.25 above. Yet, the signification of the second element of the compound \*-šḳ- and the phonetic nature of its initial /š/ are doubtful. Allow me to make a conjecture that the 2<sup>nd</sup> element is a very ancient compound-word for “fire”, most likely \*ṯḳ-b ~ ṯḳ-w: see §2.10.15 below.

**2.3.26** Egyp. ṣw “roast” (EHD I, 10): CA šawā “roast, grill” (§3.17.1 below).

**2.3.27** Ug. ap’ “viper, adder”, Ge., Te. ‘af’ot, Tna. ‘af’ut, Amh. əfunit id. (DRS I, 29), BHeb. ‘ep’ē “viper, adder, poisonous serpent” (OT, 79), CA ‘af’ā, ‘af’a(n) id. Initial /’a-/ is a prefix in CA [r. f’w] (Al ‘Ayn II, 260; LA) and in BHeb. (OT, 859)<sup>82</sup>.

Semitic initial ’- in \*’ap’-, as in many others, presents an interesting phenomenon of a radical which is not part of the root, but appears in nearly all its derivatives so that the derivative cannot exist without it. For the grammatical function of /’-/, see §2.3.19 above.

**2.3.28** Ug. ṣpn, Syr. ṣopēne pl. “wheel” (DRS I, 29), BHeb. \*’āpan obsol. “to turn, revolve”: cf. ṣpan “wheel” (OT, 79), CA [fn] is seen in CVIII ṣiftanna, said of an ass, “to drive a she-ass one time to the left and another to the right, one time straight ahead and another not straight (zigzag)”; ṣufnūnu, said of branches, “entwined”, SL fann ~ bi-finn “to go around”, Pun. pnn “to return” (NWSI II, 921): PHS stem \*pan- “face, before” as in Akk. panū “face”, BHeb. pnh, Mand. pn id. (MD, 374), CA finā “front

<sup>82</sup> In Egyp., we find both yf “serpent, viper” and F’i “mythological serpent”.

yard, i.e. *space in front of house = face of the house*, pl. 'afniya-tu, Phoen. pny "turn; face" (PG, 137), Ug. pnm "face"; pnt "corner" (UG, 531, 532), OAram. pnh "to return" (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 6). For Akk. pananum "first (time)" (AG, 93) = CA 'afānīnu(n) [fn] "first, beginning" as in 'afānīnu 'aš-šabābi (MA, 318).

Also belong here Akk. pānu "before" (AG, 93), Ge. fəna "toward", Har. fōn id., Gaf. fānnā, S. fone "to go toward", Soq. fini id., etc. (EHD, 63), BHeb. bi-pənē "in front of, before", CA bi-finā' id. Cf. CA waḡhu "face" > wuḡha-tu "direction"; wāḡiha-tu "front part (of anything)", etc.

**2.3.29** Akk. eṣēnu "to smell" (DRS I, 30), Assy. eṣēnu, *pret.* ēṣin "to smell" (King, 1898: 331): PHS stem \*šan- in CA šanā "foul, bad smell, dirt, filth" also "urine of a particular animal", SL šanneh or šannē "bad smell coming only from stagnated water or urine"; CA CII šanna, CIV 'ašanna "be foul, filthy", šunānu "bad smell", BAram., Syr. šnn "be filthy, foul", Mand. šanta "stench" (OT, 890; MD, 387), Ge. šenāwā "to smell an odor"; šena "odor", Cush.: Saho sin "odor", Kaffa çiin "smell" (HSED, n. 442).

**2.3.30** Akk. ikkāru "farmer, ploughman", BHeb. 'ikkār "farmer", Aram. 'kr, Syr. 'akkarā "ploughman, tiller", CA 'akkāru id. (Tyloch, 1975: 56, n. 3), Egyp. 'kr, ykr "earth-god" (EHD I, 11, 95), Berb.: To., So. akāl "terre, terrain, pays" ~ So. igər "champ", Cush.: Af. erkē, Sa. rike, Ga. irge "endroit, place" (VPHS, 77, n. 1): PHS stem \*kar- "field, dig" as in BHeb. kārā(h), BAram. kərā "to dig" (OT, 487), CA karā or karaya "to dig", Assy. kirū "garden, plantation" (King, 1898: 354), Phoen. kr "pasture" (NWSI I, 534), Ge. kārāyā "to dig", Har. xara, Go. kerrā-m, A. kirrā-m, S. käre, etc. id. (HED, 97), Chad.: Mofu kərɔw, Lama kura "hoe, prepare field for sowing", Hwona kūra "hoe", Jegu kur-gees id. (HSED, 8).

The morphological structure of the noun {'ikkāru/'akkāru} in Semitic languages unquestionably suggests either a base verb form \*'akar-, for its impossible to derive it from kar-, or a noun \*'akar "field, farm". The reason for this is not far to seek. The stem {Fa'āLu} may be formed from a noun or verb as in falaḡa "to plow" > fallāḡu "plowman", ḡamalū "camel" > ḡammālū "cameleer", 'ammara "to build" > 'ammāru "builder" and saḡara "to enchant, bewitch" > saḡḡāru "enchanter", 'ahaḡa "to take" > 'aḡḡādu "taker", and so forth.

a) The base form \*'akar- from which 'ikkāru ~ 'akkāru is bound to be derived has been preserved intact in CA 'akara "to dig", along with another trilateral [kwr] as in kāra "to dig in the earth" with kūra-tu fem. "city, village, district" also extends to "hive of bees". According to Farāhīdi (Al 'ayn V, 404), the verb form whether it is 'akara or CV ta'akkara is derived from the noun 'ukra-tu fem. "a hole or pit being dug near a basin or stream to filter the water", hence 'akkāru is originally "one who digs 'ukrah", MHeb. mikreh "a pit" (OT, 566), Ancient Har. axaraxara "dig a hole" (HED, 97).

b) The linguistic history of 'akkāru/'ikkāru is nearly identical with that of 'aggāna-tu ~ 'iggāna-tu as outlined in §2.3.37, n. h below.

c) The Semitic word, however, has been considered a loanword from Sumerian (cf. agar "irrigated land"), first borrowed by Akk. and through which the word passed into other Semitic languages. This is one possibility that should be taken into account.

Another possibility is that the word is native. *Whether the word is foreign or native is not a big issue.* The *real issue* is that the principal works on foreign influences on individual Semitic languages are replete with fallacies and colored by the personal opinions of their writers. A shining case is the various works on loanwords in CA. Such works, beginning to appear in the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, lack any scientific procedure necessary to determine whether a word is or is not borrowed, and completely overlook the etymology of the CA word. Moreover, the works suffer greatly from the supposed knowledge of Classical Arabic structure. For this reason, we must pay no attention to any work on this subject unless supported by evidence or plausible explanation. An adequate treatment of this topic is given in §2.24 below.

d) I suspect that [kwr] above is a compound of \*kau- “hole, opening > dig or plow” and \*’ar- perh. “to make, do”. By combining them together we get \*kw’r > kwr, using it as a verb = “make a hole in the ground, pierce the ground” or “make a kuwwa-tu (= “opening”) in the ground”: comp. Akk. ’akara “creuser un trou” (= CA ’akara above) with Akk. ’ukra-tu “boule” (VPHS ibid.) = CA kura-tu id., SL kurā also “sphere, ball, globe”.

e) I would like to make a conjecture that \*kw- lies beneath CA hakka, with caus. h- “to strike with a sword, to beat, attack”; hakku “piercing or stabbing with a spear” (also “to have sexual intercourse with” = nāka obscene id.), Ge. hakaka “to quarrel, to agitate”, Cush.: Oromo hau “to scratch, scrape” (DRS V, 407) perh. = Akk. kakkū “weapon” (AG, 81), Assy. kakku “arm, weapon” (King, 1898: 351), OffAram. kk “tooth” (NWSI I, 499).

f) CA [hkk] can hardly be separated from [škk ~ skk] (š- is caus. from \*s-, see below) as in CA šakka “to pierce with a spear”: Egyp. sk “spear”, Chad.: Gaanda šuk-ta, Gabin suk-te “spear”, Housa sōka, sūka “to peirce, slaughter”, Cush.: Ometic, Yamma, Bworo, Gim šuk- “to slaughter”: Sha, Kulere suk “knife”, Cush.: Bambala šuku “big knife” (HSED, n. 569, 570, 2268). Other CA derivatives are šikka-tu “weapon, arm”, šāki, from šākki (LA, r. škk) “fully armed, armed to the teeth” ~ sikk-iyyu “nail”; maskūku “fastened with nails”; as a verb sakka; sikka-tu “the pointed piece of iron on a plow used for breaking up soil and making furrows” also “pointed piece of iron used for plowing or digging”; sikāku ~ šikāku “row or line of trees, houses”, perh. orig. ‘*furrow*’, *looking like teeth of a comb* (LA, roots skk and škk), Akk. sikka-tu, Mand. sik-ta “nail, ploughshare” (MD, 327), OffAram. skt “tip, esp. of plough” (NWSI II, 785), Har. sākāka “put in row”, Gur. sākkākā “to plant in, pitch”, etc. (HED, 139), etc. Egyp. sk’ “to plow” (EHD II, 626), sk id. (HED II, 704), and in a compound Ur (= a god) sk’t “a god of plowing” (EHD I, 174), Chad.: Sura sak, Tangale suk “to plow” (HSED, n. 2177).

g) An ultimate connection between Sem. \*’kr and \*hgr should not be dismissed *at all*: NWS *hagar* “soil, country, town”, ESA *hgr* “plough land”, etc. (DRS V, 407): CA kawwāru = ḡawwāru, *one who digs holes in the ground*: see §2.12.40, n. 6.

h) Another view on the origin of Semitic ’ikkāru is the possibility «*que la 3<sup>em</sup> consonne représente une terminaison -ar de nom de métier, et non une radicale*» (DRS I, 19).

i) SL ḥākūrā fem. or ḥākūrah “small piece of fertile land (garden)”, apparently from

[ḥā] (i.e. ḥw) “around” and *kūrah* above<sup>83</sup>. This is the very same /ḥw/ seen in many trilaterals with the same sort of meaning, e.g. ḥṣr “to surround”, BHeb. ḥṣr id., Eth. ḥṣr “to wall in” (OT, 338), Phoen., Palm. ḥṣr “enclosure-wall, enclosed court”, Pun. ḥṣrh “court (of temple)” (NWSI I, 400-401): gen. Sem. ṣr “to wrap up, confine, bind” (§2.1.13, n. 1i above).

**2.3.31** Ug. ’zr “to gird”, Syr. mizrānā “girdle” (DRS I, 14), BHeb. ’āzar “to gird, bind round”; ’ezōr “girdle, belt, chain” (OT, 28, 30), DAram. ’zr “loincloth”, from ’zr “to gird” (NWSI I, 27), CA ta’azzara, ’i’tazara “to wrap oneself with *mi’zaratu*”<sup>84</sup>, mi’zaru(tun), ’izru “a kind of clothing”, usu. *wrapped round the west*”, Ug. izr “belt”, m’zrtm “a (doubled) garment” (UG, 530, 532)<sup>85</sup>. SL, mi’zar “a kind of clothing (*keep in mind that it is so-called only because it is wrapped round the body*)”; wazrah “a piece of cloth fastened round the waist”. All are from a Sem. stem \*zar- in CA zirru “button” also, according to Ibin Athīr (see LA, r. zrr) *a kind of rope used to fasten something like a tent*; zarara, CIV ’azarra “to button”; zarra “to bind or fasten together, buckle together”, BAram. zrz (from \*zrrz) “to bind around, gird”, and with infix \*y-: BHeb. zwr, CA zyr, etc. (OT, 275, 289). Pun. zr “small coin” (NWSI I, 339), perhaps *so-called after the shape of a button*.

Among other derivatives belonging here are Akk. azīru “poumons, bronches” and CA zauru “middle of the chest”. For the ultimate origin of roots above, see §2.3.32, n. a below, and for Akk.-CA words, see n. b of the same section below. An earlier form of all words above has been preserved in CA ’azza “to gather together, to bind things together”.

**2.3.32** Akk. ni-ṣirtu, iṣru “treasure, store-house”, Jp. ’oṣra, Syr. ’awṣera “storehouse”, Mand. ’uṣra “treasure, store”, BHeb. ’āṣar “to heap, accumulate; treasure” (DRS I, 31, OT, 83; MD, 345), EHeb., OffAram. ’wṣr “treasure” (NWSI I, 24), CA ’ayṣaru “sack full of grass and tied tightly”; ’aṣīru, said of the hair, “intertwined, thick”; ’atṣara (a strange stem ?), said of plants “be crowded closely together”; mu’taṣirū, in a fixed expression, “numerous” (LA); ’āṣira-tu = ṣila-tu “blood-relationship”; ’aṣara “to bind, tie together”; ’aṣaru “a kind of rope”, etc. (Al ’Ayn, VII, 147-148): PHS stem \*ṣar- as in Chad.: Kabalay sār “press, pack”, Bid surrey id., Migama sūra “be heavy, load” (HSED, n. 455).

a) For ṣaW- & \*ṣar-, with additional cognates, see §2.1.13, n. i. above. The stem \*ṣaW- is variant of \*ḍaW-. Section §2.12.1 below deals with the interchange of these

<sup>83</sup> The very same meaning is expressed in CA by [ḥḡr] “land around a village or town” also “garden”, pl. ma-ḥāḡiru as in the PIP of Labid:

«bakarat bihi ḡurṣiyyatun maḡtūratun  
tarwī (’a)l maḡāḡira bāzilun ’ulkūmu» (LA).

<sup>84</sup> As in the PIP of Khansa:

«wa ’in ḍukira (’a)l maḡdu ’alfaytahu  
ta-’azzara bi(’a)lmaḡdi ḡumma (’i)r tadā» (DK, p. 30, L. 8).

<sup>85</sup> Ug. final -m is perh. a dual ending = CA, Akk. -ān (§§2.17.19, 2.17.26 below).



two radicals, and is one among other sections intended to show how a large number of phonetically different roots, including /š/ as one of their radicals, are ultimately derived from one single proot. It is also important to see sections dealing with additional variants of the same proot, esp. §2.12.16 and §2.17.38 below.

b) CA šauru, BAram., JAram., Heb., Mand., Syr. šwr “neck, throat” (MD, 356), i.e. *connecting, binding* = Akk. and CA words in §2.3.31 above.

**2.3.33** BHeb. ’adāb “to pine away, languish” (OT, 12) = CA ’aḏāba CIV of ḏāba id.: CA ḏāba “to melt away”, hence also “to pine away” = BHeb. dā’b (dwb, db’, etc.) id. (OT, 208).

Semitic [ḏ’b] ~ [ḏwb] signifies “to melt, thaw, dissolve”, as in BHeb. zwb “to flow (of water)”; *Trop.* “to flow away, i.e. to pine away”, Aram. zwb, dwb “to flow, to melt” (OT, 274), CA ḏāba “to melt, to liquefy, to pine away”, Akk. zābu “se dissoudre, suinter”, Meh. ḏeyob, Jib. ḏeb “fondre” (DRS IV, 329). The CA word applies primarily to “solid frozen snow” and is a compound of ḏaw- as in CA ḏa’ā (in old Hiḡāz dialect) ~ ḏawā (in old Naḡd dialect) “to fade (away), wither” and \*’ab “water” (LA; Amāli II, 166). For [’ab], see §2.2.22 above.

Here belongs CA ḏabula = ḏawā in meaning + *any plant, flower, vegetable*. So, it is said of a flower, a plant, etc. “to whither”. This also a compound whose second element is stem [bal] “blossom, flower” as in CA balla-tu. Also see §2.17.63 below.

**2.3.34** Ge. ’asta’zaba “to urinate”, (sounds to me like CX stem ’ista’zaba of a trilateral \*’zb, where ’- is caus. “make pour out”) = CA CIV ’aziba [zb] “to flow (water)”. Cohen (DRS I, 12) connects the Ge. word with Ge. ’azeb “south-east wind”. The latter Eth. term is cognate with CA ’azyabu [zyb] in *Huthail* and some other old dialects = “south”, but in *Ḳuraysh* (i.e. Mecca) = “south wind” and occurred in *Hadith*. LA reports that «*All sailors from Juddah to Aden know no term for ‘south’ other than ‘azaybu*». This fact implies that both *ḡanūbu*, the most common term for “south”, and *’azyabu* were then used interchangeably. Another derivative of the same root is, according to Cohen, BHeb. ’ezōb “hyssop”, *much used by the Hebrews in their sacred purifications and sprinklings* (OT, 28).

a) To my understanding, CA [zb] and [zwb] in CA zāba “to flow” are from the same proot in §2.3.33 above and so is Ge. ’astazaba above.

b) BHeb. zrb \*zorab “to pour out”; m-zrb “gutter”, BAram. zrb “to pour out”, Syr. zarībtā “violent rain” ~ zarīptā id., also BHeb. zarzīp “a pouring rain, violent shower”, Jp. zarzīpā “drop of liquid”, Eth.: Tna. zārāb bālā “to pour out, to shed tears; weep” (OT, 286, 288; DRS VIII, 789), CA zrb “to flow, drip, pour out”; mizrābu inst. “gutter”. SL, zarab, said of any container of water, expresses “leak water because there is an opening in it”; zarzab “leaking water from all sides”.

c) Sem. [zrp] above is obviously from [ḏrp] as in CA ḏarafa “to shed tears, to flow”, a compound of [ḏar] “scatter” and \*-’ap- “water”, a variant of [’ab] or vice-versa. As for [zrb], it is a variant form of CA ḏaraba, often said of the nose, “to drip”.

d) Egyp. ḏbb “waters”, Chad.: Bol žubb- “to pour”, Mofu žəb “be wet”, Daba žub id. (HSED, n. 2669) are cognate with CA ḏabbu id.; ḏabābu “fog”, etc.

e) There is no relationship between Ge. words for ‘urinate’ and ‘south wind’.

### Comments

After a deep study of roots with /z/, esp. with initial /z/, I have come to the conclusion that /z/ has developed from a number of different consonants such as /ð/, /s/, some others are from /š/ (i.e. < earlier /ḏ, ḍ/) either directly or, as is often the case, via /s/, and /ḡ/<sup>86</sup>.

**2.3.35** OAram. ’mn “firmly” (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 1), OffAram., Palm. hymnt “faithful”, Syr. ’t’emn “to rest, preserve”, Ge. ’amna “be firm; faith”, etc. (DRS I, 23), BHeb. ’āman “to stay, support; be sure, true, faithful”; he’emīn “to trust, confide in, believe”; ne’eman “be firm, faithful”; ’āmānā “covenant” (OT, 66), Phoen. ’mn “to support” (PG, 78), CA ’āminu “safe, secure”; ’āmana “be safe, secure, to believe, to protect”, Sab. ’mn “be secure; security, safety; amen”; h’mn “to protect”; mnt “deposit entrusted for safekeeping with someone” (SD, 6) = CA ’amāna-tu id.

Cognates from Hamitic languages are: Egyp. mn “be stable, firm, remain, fixed; abode, habitation” (EHD I, 296-297; EG, 568), Cush.: Som. man “house”, Ga. manā, Sid. minē, etc. id., Oromo mana, Sid., Dar., Had. mine “house”, Chad.: Sha mune “house”, Tangale man, Dera māna, Pero mina, Sumray mana, Ndam mām “place” (VPHS, 83, n. 38; HSED, n. 1723). It is most likely that CA Manā-tu “a worshipped god (in pre-Islam)” and Egyp. Mn-t “god” belong here, whereas CA *manā* may not<sup>87</sup>. Moreover, both Egyp. and CA cognates express two contradictory meanings: Egyp. [mn] “be firm” also “be sick, weak” = CA [mn] “strong, mighty” also “(physically) feeble, weak”.

**2.3.36** Akk. agāmu, CA ’aḡama “être irrité, en colère”, BHeb. ’ōgem “incandescent” (DRS I, 7), CA ’aḡima “to flame up a fire”; CV ta’ḡḡama-t, said of the fire, = CV ta’aḡḡaḡa-t (see §2.5.8 below) “be flamed up (fire)”; said of the day, “become very hot”

<sup>86</sup> It is sufficient for the time being to cite two examples, the first shows that /z/ is from and earlier /ḡ/, while the second shows that both /z/ and /ḡ/ are from an earlier /ð/.

a) CA ’azfalā ~ ’aḡfalā “to startle away” (ŠHH IV, 2717), CA ’iḡtaffa ~ ’izdaffa, etc.,

b) CA *hizaffu* ~ *hiḡaffu*, often said of a male ostrich, “big and tall”. According to LA, *hizaffu* “ostrich” is so-called because of its frequent *zaff-* = “speed; rapidness, quickness” or “the start of running for an ostrich”. This initial /hi-/ , first mentioned and illustrated with some examples in §2.1.6.8, n. b above, is established as a proot with a well defined meaning in §3.4 below. The trilaterals [hzf] and [hḡf] are from [hðf], as in haḏafa (~ haḏaba) “to speed, hasten”, and this is in turn from [zf] < [ðf] as in ḏaffa id. (see §2.12.22 below for cognates and additional kindred trilaterals).

<sup>87</sup> CA manā , pl., “house”, as in the PIP of Labīd:

«darasa (’a)l manā bimuṭālī’in fa’abāni...»

The term is traditionally considered as a truncated form of *manāzilu* [nzl], pl., “house” (Ṣaḥībī, p. 230); nuzlu “inn”, orig. *place for rest* for a short period of time = Akk., Assy. manzal-tu “resting- place”, Mand. mandalta “setting” (MD, 248; King, 1989: 367) = Sab. nzl “descending, descent” (SD, 102): cf. CA nuzūlu “descending, descent”; nazala “to descend, come down”, with prep. ’alā “on”, “make a temporary residence or stay, be a guest of”, with prep. ’an (“off, away from”), “to dismount or get off, as from a horse”, etc. all are from the trilateral [nzl], this is in turn from a stem [zal] as in CA zalla “to slip down”.

(AM, 20-21). Anbari says:

«wa yaumin katannūri (ʿa)l ʾimāʾi saġarnahu  
ḥamalna ʾalayhi (ʿa)l ġiḍla ḥattā ta-ʾaġġamā» (LA).

It is obvious that [ʾgm] is orig. CIV of [gm] “to burn”. A kindred root is [ʾgn] as in Ug. ʾgn “fire”, the exact cognate in CA is ʾāġinu (= ʾāġimu: see §2.3.37 below) “stagnant water”. Was the earlier meaning of the word “a type of hot or boiling water sourcing from the earth”? See §2.3.37 below.

**2.3.37** HS [ʾgm] also signifies “marsh, stagnated water” as in Akk. agammu, Aram. ʾagmā, Syr. ʾegmā id., Mand. agma “marsh, swamp” (MD, 5; DRS I, 7), Assy. agammu “swamp” (King, 1898: 318), CA ʾāġimu “stagnant water”; taʾaġġama “be stagnated (water)”, BHeb. ʾagam “stagnant water, pool, marsh” (OT, 11). It seems unlikely that the word is a compound of \*ʾg- “salty water, bitter water” as in CA ʾuġāġu id. and \*-m “water”.

1) Is there any historical relationship between \*ʾgm and \*ʾgn as suggested in §2.3.36 above?

CA ʾāġimu (§2.3.37 above) ~ ʾāġinu “stagnant (water)”, with ʾaġġāna-tu (in old Ṭāyʾ dialect) ~ ʾiġġāna-tu (in other dialects) fem. “a large basin dug in the ground” also “basin, bowl, vessel” = Akk. agannu, Ug. ʾgn, Phoen. ʾgn, BHeb. ʾaggān, OffAram. ʾgn, Palm., Nab. ʾgnʾ, Mand. agnania, etc., Cush.: Som. agaan “jar”, Oromo gaanii id, Ga., Ag., Sa., Af. gān “jar”, Egyp. ykn, ykʾnʾ “bowel, basin, vessel, pot” (NWSII, 11-12; MD, 5; DRS I, 7; VPHS, 78, n. 12; EHD I, 94, 95). Such semantic and phonological resemblances raises the question whether their final radicals \*/-m/ & \*/-n/ are not originally variants of one single sound or whether the radicals are reflexes of two different proots. To Semitists, however, the question is never mooted, for they consider \*ʾgn and \*ʾgm as autonomous roots, but they have fantastic idea about their etymologies: [ʾgm] is native, whereas [ʾgn] is attributed to borrowing as the following ‘statement of fact’ shows:

«Sans doute empr. successifs de l’aram. a l’ak. et des autres  
langues à L’aram. L’ak. lui-même est tributaire de l’ég. par  
l’intermédiaire hit.: ég. ʾikn > Hit. aganni» (DRS II, ibid.).

A just evaluation of this statement will be given in n. 4b below.

2) There is still a third trilateral to be dealt with here which is [ʾgl] as in CA ma-ʾġalu “marsh, large reservoir or cistern” = Sab. ʾgl “tank, cistern” (SD, 3), BHeb. ʾeglē (Job. 38, 28) “reservoirs of the dew” (OT, 11).

3) Are HS [ʾgm], [ʾgn], [ʾgl], etc. all based on proot \*gw- “concave hole, hollowed object, object curved like a sphere” plus a proot for “water”, i.e. \*-m, -n, and \*-l? The answer is certainly negative, and the etymology of each trilateral is discussed below.

4) Trilateral [ʾgn], i.e. the one Semitists attributed to borrowing with such full confidence and certainty that leaves no room even for the slightest degree of doubt, is from a compound \*gaʾ and \*ʾin. The 1<sup>st</sup> element signifies “a form of, a kind of” (see §2.17.83) and the 2<sup>nd</sup> “a sort of container”, later develops into “vase, vessel”. (see §2.10.22 below). Compounding \*gaʾ- and \*ʾin- gives rise to \*ʾgn, \*gʾn, or \*gnʾ. Here also belong Ge. ganəʾ/, Tna. gānʾi, Te. gānəʾ, Amh., Gour. gan “jar” Har. gān “big jar”,

Cush.: Ga. gan “jar” (DRS III, 143; HD, 72).

4a) CA ’aġġāna-tu/’iġġāna-tu fem. reminds me of ’akkāru/’ikkāru masc. (with ’akkāra-tu/’ikkāra-tu fem.) “farmer” (§3.3.30 above), where both having a stem {Fa’āLu} signifying “one who does + meaning of the root”, i.e. *the agent, doer of the action denoted by the verb* as in ’ahhādu masc. “one who takes (exceedingly)”, fem. ’ahhādatu; ’abbālu masc. “one who has, tends or herds camels”, fem. ’abbālatu; habbāzu masc. “baker”, fem habbāza-tu; etc. A basic question arises here: why is it that ’aġġānatu does not overtly express an agentive meaning?

If I stop here without giving the real meaning of ’aġġāna-tu (for this meaning, *see the next paragraph below*), one may believe that Fränkel (1962: 688) and other self-appointed experts on loanwords in Semitic, have been right in tracing the word to Syriac.

The conflicting evidence presented in the foregoing paragraph is just cited to convince the reader of one simple fact: *one cannot and must not pronounce a judgment on the origin of a word in a language unless he is fully equipped with knowledge of the language. All those who have made the judgment are for sure at war with this simple fact* (see §2.24 below).

As for ’aġġāna-tu, it is clear to me from the very beginning that the real meaning of the word is lit. “one that holds, i.e. *holder*”, thus “basin, bowl, etc.” = holder of (water). Similar examples are fem. wallā’a-tu “lighter; i.e. lit. *one which lights*”, šawwāya-tu “gridiron, grill; i.e. lit. *one which roasts*”, yarrāya-tu “one which glues”, yassāla-tu “one that washes”, ġallāya-tu “one which cleans”, kammāša-tu “one which holds, i.e. *pincers*” daffāya-tu “one which warms”, naddāba-tu “one who laments a dead person”, and so on. All such words are *agentive nouns* meaning “one who/which/that does X” or “an instrument that does X”, where X is the meaning of the verb.

4b) Returning to Cohen’s *statement of fact*, Cohen as a Semitist should have both noted and been aware of a *very simple fact* that Akk. *agannu* cannot be a loan from any language for one obvious reason; repeating the last radical is used in Semitic, chiefly in Akk. and CA, to form nouns, esp. *agent nouns*, e.g. Akk. *ḥazannu* “mayor”, *kirissu* “needle”, *nisakku* “priest”, *kutimmu* “goldsmith”, *namarru* “shining, i.e. *one that shines*”, CA *ma’inna-tu* fem. “mark, sign, token”, i.e. *one that tells, indicates, makes one know*: cf. *ma’ana* “to know, learn”, *ḫumuddu* “strong”, *’aballu* “tough”, etc. (see Moscati, 1969: §12.11: c). It goes without saying that adjectives formed by repeating the last radical can function in CA as *agentives* hence *ḫumuddu* “one who is strong”, etc.

#### Comments

CA has a number of other stems in which the last radical is reduplicated, a common one of which is {adj. muF’aL’iL²L²u (= *one that ...*), vb ’iF’aL’aL²L²a}. The basic characteristic of this stem is that its radical {-L¹-} must have *as a rule* the feature specification [+ back], and exceptions to the rule are quite rare and all are later developments. Some examples are: *muzlayibbu*, said of a young bird, “having soft fluffy feathers forming the first plumage” (< *zayabu* “down of a bird”), *muḫsa’innu* “solid, hard” (< *ḫāsī* “hard, tough”), *’idmaḥalla* “to fade away, vanish, disappear”; adj. *muḍmaḥillu* (< *ḍaḥlu* “shallow or very little water”), *mušmaḥirru* “lofty, tall”, as a verb

*'išmaḥarra* (šāmiḥu “high, lofty, towering”), *muzmahirru* “chilly” as a verb *'izmaḥarra* “to shine, glitter” (= zahara id.), *'ikfaharra* “to darkle” as in Poet.: «'idā ('a)l lailu 'adgā wa 'ikfaharrat nuḡumuhu...» (LA), from pre-Islamic CA *kafara* “to cover, hide” > Islamic CA “disbelieve”, i.e. *hide his true belief*, *'iḡša'arra* “to shudder, feel a crawly sensation” (š'r “feel” and for [ḡa-], see §2.17.83 below), and so forth. For additional examples, see Jamharah II, 1219-1221. Most of such words are wrongly considered by old Arab scholars as derived from quadrilaterals. For a similar phenomenon in Egyp. and Heb., see §2.11.22, n. a below.

The trilateral \*g'n is preserved in CA ḡu'na-tu fem. “round basket”, and \*gn' is seen in CA 'aḡna'u “hunchbacked”, from “be bent, curved”; muḡna'a-tu fem. “pit of a grave”; mu-ḡanna'u “a shield, so called from its *spherical* or *curved shape*” (= ḡn ~ mḡn id. in all Semitic languages).

For what concerns [ʾgm] and [ʾgl], it is possible that they are compounds of the same \*g- plus \*m- & -l “two different kinds of *water*” (§2.17.83 below).

**2.3.38** Phoen. 'gd “to bind, tie together”; EHeb. 'gd, *Niph.* “be tied up” (NWSI I, 8), Akk. agidd-, agitt- “head-band”, BAram. 'gd “to bind, tie”, etc. (DRS I, 6)<sup>88</sup>.

1) A derivative of [ʾgd] is Phoen. 'gdd “gang of bandits” (NWSI I, 9) = BHeb. 'aguddā “a band of men, troop” (OT, 11). Knowledge of the exact CA cognate will surely help determine the proot underlying the trilateral. The exact CA cognate is *ḡundu* “troops, army”, from \*ḡuddu, with the first \*-d- dissimilating to /-n-/, sg. *ḡundī*, i.e. *ḡundiy* (-ī ~ -iy = gen., i.e. (one) *belonging to a group or to a band of men; soldier*” = Akk. [gdd] in *gudūdu* “marauding band” (NWSI I, 213). I believe that here is the right place to consider the question that repeating the last radical was once used to make a type of plural nouns (see §2.1.14.3, esp. n. 3). Suppose that this method had indeed existed, it would have been a later development and based on the analogy of full reduplication.

2) A derivative of [gd] is CA ḡundu (with infix -n-) “city, district”, Har. gānda “village”, W. gändä “section of a village”. Leslau (HED, 73) traces the Eth. words to Cush. as in Ga. ganda “village”.

**2.3.39** Sab. trilateral [ʾlm] expresses two closely related meanings and corresponds to two traditional CA trilaterals as follows:

a) Sab. [ʾlm] “to hold a ritual banquet for a deity” = CA 'awlama CIV of [wlm] “to hold a wedding banquet”. Both trilaterals are from *lamma* “to gather, collect; bind”, hence walamu “girdle” also “fetter”, etc. see §2.4.20, SA: Meh. awōlem, Hars. awlōm, Shh. ulm “prepare a meal”, Jib. ōlem id. (DRS VII, 552).

b) Sab. 'lm-t coll. “group of associates”, this without prefixed \*'- is cognate with CA lumma-tu fem. coll. “group of people, usu. *of equal age, friends*”; lumā “friends of equal

<sup>88</sup> The notion of “bind, tie together” is also expressed by [ʾkd] as in CA 'aḡada id.; BHeb. 'āḡad, BAram. 'kd id., Ge. 'aḡādä, Te. 'aḡda id., Har. agāda, E., M., Ms., Go. aggādä, etc. id., En. akādä, agādä, Gt. akkādä id. (HED, 21; OT, 810), also comp. CA 'unḡūdu “bunch of grapes” = 'uḡūdu ~ 'uḡdu “raisins”. As a matter of fact, some other trilaterals beginning with 'aḡ- express the same sort of meaning.

age”.

**2.3.40** OAram., OffAram., Hatra, JAram. ’zl “to go (to)” (NWSI I, 26); OffAram. m’zl perh. “departure” (NWSI II, 587), BHeb. ’āzal intrans. “to roll off, i.e. to go away, depart, esp. quickly, suddenly, also “to go anywhere, to take a journey”, BAram., Syr., Samar ’zl “to go away, to depart” (OT, 28-29). Also in Heb. ’āzal “to disappear” (Rabin, 1975: 93, n. 93) = CA zāla “to go away, disappear”; CIV ’azāla “make disappear, go away”, etc. §2.11.17 below.

A form [’zl] exists in CA and expresses, as in ’azlu “tightness, strained conditions”, etc. with ’azal “eternity”, and has developed from a neg. sentence *lam yazal* “it is still”, i.e. lit. *does not depart, disappear, vanish*: lam “not” being dropped and ya- (of yazal) changed into ’a-.

a) The interchange of /’/ and /’/ gives rise to [’zl] expressing in CA “to remove, i.e. *make s.o. move away* (from a position, from a place, from office), *separate from*”, hence also “to depose, to set aside or apart” = Sab. caus. h-’zl “to remove”, while Sab. ground stem ’zl “to seclude oneself” = CA CVIII ’i’tazala “to seclude oneself”. On the other hand, Sab. s’t-’zl ~ ’zl, said of the rain, “be deficient, to fail” (SD, 10, 24) = CA ’zl “be drought”.

In addition, CA ’azala also expresses “to turn aside from the natural place where is supposed to be”; ’a’zalu adj. “deflecting, turning aside” as in the PIP of Imri’ Al Qais:

«...bidāfin fuwaiḳa (’a)l ’ardi laisa bi ’a’zali»;

’a’zalu “isolated sandy place; defenseless, armless”.

b) BHeb. עזאזל ’azāzēl for עזלזל azālzēl (for its etymology, see OT, 764) is most likely a broken pl. having either a stem {Fa’ā’īL} as in CA ḥasāsīnu [ḥsn] “goldfinches”, ’aḡāḡīlu *dimin.* pl. “calves” or a stem {Fa’ālīL} as in CA ’anāḡīḡu “wonderful horses” (for the last two forms, see Al ’Ayn I, 227, 232), etc.

#### Comments

Semitists assume that the plural «*formed by internal modification* (broken plural) *is principally developed in Arabic and Abyssinian*» (O’Leary, 1969: §122: c). This is of course a groundless assumption. The naked truth is that this particular kind of plural is one of the oldest types in the family: comp. CA ’iṣba’u “finger” > pl. ’aṣābi’u with Egy. ḏb’ “finger” > pl. yḏb’ (EHD I, 104 & II, 905) and CA ṣayīrun “small, young” > pl. (more common) ṣiyārun, (less common) ṣuyārun with Assyr. ṣaḥrum “small, young” > pl. OAssyr. ṣuḥrum (Moscatti, 1969: §12.44).

**2.3.41** Akk. enēšu “be feeble, weak”; enšu “weak”, BHeb. ’ānūš “ill, incurable, desperate” (OT, 73; DRS I, 26), Soq. ’enes “be small”, Amh. annäsä, Gur. an(n)äsä, Arg. hannäsa (HED, 29). The caus. /’-/ was first added to a trilateral [n’š], causing its medial radical /’-/ to disappear. The original trilateral is seen in Ge. nə’əsä, Tna. nă’asä, Te. nă’as “be little, weak” (HED, 29), BHeb. nūš “be sick, ill at ease”, in Syr. id. (OT, 660) = SL nūšī “little, small”, and this meaning is, to my understanding, based solely on \*nū. It is the same proot seen in CA nūna-tu “the small dimple in a baby or child’s chin” and SL nūnē (nūna-tu) “a kind of small vessel designed for a baby’s use instead of

bathroom”: Egyp. nw “baby, child”.

**2.3.42** Akk. abāru “être fort”, Ug. ’ibr “jeune taureau”, CA ’abira “être en bon état et intact; être probe, intègre”, Aram. ’brw “force, puissance”, Amh. abret “predominance, orgueil” (DRS I, 5), Samal ’brw “force, power” (NWSI I, 7), BHeb. ’abbīr “strong, mighty; powerful; one strong, a mighty one” (OT, 6): PHS stem [bar] “be strong” as in CA ’abarra CIV of barra “to triumph over, prevail over, to conquer”; ’ibrāru “victory, conquest” as in the PIP of Ṭarfah:

«yakšifūna (’a)ḏ ḏurri ’an ḏī ḏurrihim  
wa yubirrūna ’alā (’a)l ’abiyyi (’a)l mubarri» (LA).

In addition, birru “heart”, from “be strong”. The trilateral [bry] expresses a similar meaning as in CIV ’inbarā “to defy, challenge”: bārā “to compete with, to combat, to fight a duel with”; burāya-tu “strength, power” = Sab. brr “to come into the open to fight” (SD, 31) with brw ~ bry “to destroy an enemy” (SD, 32).

**2.3.43** BHeb. ’ētān ~ ’etān “firmness, strength”. Cohen derives the word from a root [’yt] (DRS I, 18), but Gesenius (OT, 46) correctly derives it from [ytn]. The word also expresses “perennity, perpetuity”, spoken esp. of *water*. Both meanings are expressed by CA wātinu id. (LA). It also expresses “continuous” like Sab. mh-wtn-m “continuous (rain)” (SD, 165): see §2.12.20 below.

**2.3.44** CA ’afida [r. ’fd] “to go fast, hurry”, obviously CIV of [fdd] as in fadda “to run + beat the ground with the feet, tread on heavily, stamp with the feet”, said of camels, lit. “to scratch the ground with their padded feet as they run”, said of birds “to flap the wings up and down (in order to accelerate the speed)”, Egyp. ’fd “to march, bend the leg; part of the leg” (EHD I, 6): PHS stem \*pad as in Egyp. fd ~ pt “to run”; ptpt “to tread down, trample down” (EG, 566; EHD I, 253, 255).

LA (r. fdd) states: «*It is said: fadfada*— a human being and camel — “make a sound or noise”, *this means that the sound (= echo) of their footsteps are heard as they run*», hence fadfada-tu “echo of footsteps”. The original meaning of CA wafada is “to come to on foot” (§2.14.13 below), derived from \*fad(d)u “foot”: comp. ḳadima “to come to” from ḳadamu “foot”. The word \*fadu is still seen in some trilaterals, one of which is [fd’], with ’-ext.: “deviating foot” (cf. Al ’Ayn IV, 394), a compound of [fad] “foot” and [’au] “bending, crooked, twisting”: see §2.17.2, ft. <sup>1</sup>.

By prefixing /’-/ to \*fad-, we get ’afada “to put the feet very close to each other and jump (the two feet will look as *one* foot”, perh. orig. *standing on one foot and jump*. The proot has been preserved in Egyp. pd “foot”; pd-tī “strider” (EHD I, 255) = CA faddādu “one who treads heavily on the ground as he walks in a vigorous or arrogant manner”, Meh. awōfada, hawfūd “chercher une trace de pas” with wəfūd “demander (une femme) en mariage”, etc. (DRS VII, 583). The last meaning expressed by the Meh. has orig. nothing to do with “marriage”; it is = SL *wafd* “envoy” whose purpose is either ‘*making engagement*’ or ‘*making peace between tribes and clans*’: CA wafdu “envoy” above: see §2.14.13 below.

Among other trilaterals in which [pad] “food” is found we may cite ḳafadu “walking

on the front part of the feet”. For proot [ka-], see §2.17.83 below.

**2.3.45** CA \*’ahaba is common as a verb only in CV ta’ahhaba “make oneself ready” and as a n. ’uhba-tu “readiness” is evidently from [hab] in habba “to rise”.

**2.3.46** CA ’adda-ni [’d̥w] = madda-ni (Al ’Ayn VII, 76): see §2.1.6.7, n. 7d, under *Comments* above and §2.10.25 below.

**2.3.47** Akk. \*epēku “render fort”, BHeb. hit’appēk “se contrôler, se contenir, se render fort”: ’āpaḫ “to hold, to contain”; *apēk* name of a city Aphek, i.e. *a strong city*, Sab. ’fḫ “to restrain, keep under control (wind, flood)” also “be solid, strong”, CA ’afiḫa “l’emporter en qc., être savant” also “to excel, to surpass”; ’āfiḫu “one who is the most knowledgeable and most generous” (DRS I, 29; OT, 79-80; SD, 2).

The Semitic trilateral has a caus. prefix /’-/ and is from the root in CA fauḫ “above”; fāḫa “to excel, surpass; be excellent, outstanding”; ta-fauwuḫu “superiority, ascendancy, pre-eminence”; as a v. tafauwaḫa.

**2.3.48** Sem. [’bs I] as in Akk. abūs-, abuss- “mangeoire”, BHeb. ’ebūs id.; ’ābūs “engraisser”; ’ēbūs “a stall, stable where cattle are fed”, Eth.: Amh. ’abāsā “oindre de beurre” (DRS I, 4), BAram., Talm. ’bs “to fodder, eat largely, fatten” (OT, 9): CA bassu, baṣīsa-tu “a kind of food, a kind of bread”; CIV ’abassa “to invite someone to eat”.

a) Sem. [’bs II] as in CA ’abasa, “to subjugate, oppress, humiliate, frighten”; CII ’abassa “to belittle, debase” (MA, 17), hence ’ibsu “evil, bad” = Ge. ’abbāsā “sin”, Har. abāsa “trouble, misfortune”, Amh. abāsa “trouble” (HED, 17). Here also belongs BHeb. mē-būsā “a treading down, esp. of enemies by the victors (OT, 532). All are from a stem [bas] “to debase, to drive s.o. away”, perh. BHeb. būs “to trample under foot, e. g. in neglect and contempt”.

**2.3.49** Semitic has a pair of roots [hb] and [ḥb] “to love”, where the derivatives of each pair concur semantically with each other in Semitic language divisions, but differ phonologically. Moreover, both members are found in the same language division.

1) We have, on the one hand, Ug. ’hb “to love”, BHeb. ’āhab id., Pun., OffAram. ’hb id. (DRS I, 10), and on the other hand, Pun., Palm. ḥbb “to love” (NWSI I, 343), CA ḥabba id., BHeb. ḥābab id.; ḥōbāb “beloved” also a pers. name Hobab (= CA ḥabību “beloved” also a pers. name *Habib*), Sab. ḥbb “adherent” (SD, 65), Tham. ḥbb “to love” (Branden, 1950: 513). Gesenius (OT, 291) sees that

*«The primary idea lies in breathing upon, warming, cherishing; whence חב (ḥōb) lap, bosom, in which we cherish; comp. further under the root חב. A manifest trace of this origin is found in Syr. [ḥbb] to burn, as fire; (derives into) a burning, heat, espec. from blowing».*

The same idea is also expressed by [hab] “to flame up a fire; heat, etc.” in various HS language divisions (see §2.17.36 below). On the other hand, CA ḥabḥaba, said of a fire, “to flame up, incandesce”, derived from “spark” resulting from friction, as of two



stones, hence *nāru ḥubāḥib* “sparks thrown off from a burning substance” as in the PIP of Nabīyah:

«wa tūḳidu bi (ʾa)ṣ ṣuffāḥi nāra (ʾa)l ḥabāḥiba».

Another derivative is *ḥubāḥibu* “a kind of fly that gives off light as it flies at night”.

1a) There is a close relationship between “spark” and *ḥabba-tu* “a single particle” of any kind of crops, also “a seed, grain, pimple”, since they resemble each other in shape. The pl. form is *ḥubūbu* = Sab. ḥbb “cereal crops” (SD, 65).

1b) Initial /ʾ-/ of Can.-Aram. [ʾhb] above is linguistically identical with that of CA CIV ʾaḥabba “to love”.

1c) There is no relation between ‘love’ and ‘flame up a fire or burn’ here as propounded by Gesenius.

1d) Both stems [hab] and [ḥab] are variants of one single form [ḥab] whose earlier signification is “rejoice” as in Egyp. yhb caus. “to rejoice, be glad”; yhbwt pl. “love-woman, concubine, dancing woman” ~ ḥb “rejoicing, festivity”.

**2.3.50** Akk. ʾisinn-, ʾiššinn- “fête”, Heb. ʾešūn, Aram.: Jp. ʾašūnā “temps” (DRS I, 35), CA ʾisānu “ancient ruins”; ʾusnu “remainder of old fat or flesh”; ʾāsānu “the rest or remnant of an old thing”: PHS stem \*θin in CA θinnu “desiccated grass” (clearly from *the passage of time*), Egyp. θnʾ “be old, old age, aged”, but see §3.12.37 below.

**2.3.51** Egyp. ʾrf “rest, repose, death”: rf “to rest” (EHD I, 7, 423).

**2.3.52** BHeb. ʾillēṣ “to press, to urge”, Syr. ʾelaṣ “to crowd, throng; to press”, Mand. ʾlṣ “be narrow”; alaṣ “to press”, Jp. ʾulṣān “distress, famine” (DRS I, 21; OT, 60), Pun. mlṣh (\*m-ʾlṣ) “to press, to oppress” (NWSI II, 645). All are from a stem [laṣ] in CA laṣaṣu, said of molar teeth or of thighs, “be very close to each other so that one cannot see any opening between them”, i.e. *sticking together*, as a vb laṣṣa = raṣṣa (see §2.7.13 below). Even CA liṣṣu “thief” (in Old Ṭaiʾ liṣtu id., with /-ṭ/ being part of the root, pl. luṣūṣu with a variant luṭūtu), is derived from notion “sticking to s.t”. To the same stem belong some trilaterals such as [lṣb] in CA laṣiba “be narrow, to stick, be tight”; liṣbu “a narrow passage (i.e. *narrow opening*)” = Ug. lṣb “opening between rows of teeth” (UG, 531) and [lṣḳ] in CA laṣiḳa (in Old Tamim) ~ lasiḳa (in Old Ḳais) ~ lazaḳa (in Old Rabiʾah) (LA) “to stick or adhere to”.

#### Comments

Initial /l-/ like /r-/ does not often add to my knowledge of the root-meaning in which it occupies the first position any unpredictable semantic modification. It only provides in some words a shade of meaning. Conversely, the absence of /l-/ from the same word does make any difference as far as its meaning is concerned. This statement applies to very numerous Hamito-Semitic trilaterals. It is either a grammatical element (verbal prefix forming *imperative*?) or a proot having to do with “near, close to, sticking to”, though in some roots it is a proot, expressing “tongue”, among others (see §2.17.41 below). My knowledge of the trilateral meaning is solely based on the two remaining radicals. For example, HS [lhk] and [lḥs] = “to lick” are from [ḥak] and [ḥas], both

express, broadly speaking, “touch”, with two different applications (§2.17.44 below). The former applies to ‘touch the body’ with the *finger nail*, “to itch”, and the later with the tongue, “lick with the tongue”. Another example is lahada “to exhaust, burden, tire out” = hadda “to demolish, ruin”. SL uses hadd to express both meanings, as in had-ni “burdened, destroyed, or exhausted me”. Also, consider *lamasa* and *massa* “touch with the hand” (§2.17.32 below). This chapter includes large numbers of roots with the very same /l-/, and old Arab scholars hinted in their analysis of some roots that /l-/ = “sticking, cleaving” (see §2.17, n. 6b below).

The same account also holds true of final /-l/ in many traditional roots, e.g. ḡaʿafa ~ ḡaʿfala “to smite to the ground, kill” also “turn up side down”.

## 2.4 /h-/:

### *Compounds With Initial Proot [haW-]*

Prefixed /h-/ is of two different origins: (a) *a caus. prefix* in some Semitic languages and (b) *an essential element of a compound* in all Hamito-Semitic languages.

As a prefix, /h-/ is used in Sab, BHeb., OAram., etc. as a caus. prefix: cf. Moscati, 1969: §16.12; O'Leary, 1969: 221f; Gray, 1971: §§322-324. The prefix was also used in CA side by side with /'a-/ (cf. §3.2 above) and was identified by old Arab scholars as being a variant of /'-/ in many trilaterals as in *harāḳa* [r. hrḳ] ~ *'arāḳa* [rḳ] "to pour out" (= BHeb. *hērīḳ* id.), *haḡḡa* ~ *'aḡḡa* "to flame up a fire", *hiḡdam* ~ *'iḡdam* "urge a horse to move forward", assumed by Farāhīdī to be a compound of *haḡ* + *dam* (Al 'Ayn IV, 116): comp. Cush.: Ga. *hag*, *haḳ* "the sound used to make the donkey go", Har. *ḥak* id., *ḥak bāya* "to drive a donkey" (HED, 81).

Farāhīdī recognized /h-/ as a variant of caus. /'-/ in the language and stated the following rule:

«Initial /h-/ is variant of /'-/ and whoever says *'aharāḳa* ("to pour out", with two caus. prefixes: '- & h-), he makes a false analogy» (Al 'Ayn III, 365).

Some other examples are: *'arāḥa* ~ *harāḥa* "make one rest" (MA, 27, 33, 413; LA), *harāḥa* "give rest" beside *'arāḥa*; *harāda* "to wish" beside *'arāda*; *haymana* "believe" beside *'āmana* (BHeb. *he'ēmīn* id.). In nearly all cases of 'interchange', the original sound is /'/, e.g. *'iyru* ~ *hiyru* "name of the North" (*yahyaru* "wind"), *'iyyāka* ~ *hiyyāka* "don't you ever", *'ayā* ~ *hayā* "O (you)", *hašāšu* ~ *'ašāšu* = *'aširu* "active, energetic", *'arḡa'a* ~ *'arḡaha* "postpone, delay", etc. (LA).

1) Apart from causative /h-/, which is originally variant of /'-/, there is another /h/ whose function- as evidence tells- is to add a sense of exaggeration<sup>89</sup> to the meaning of the word to which it is added; a sense that inspires reverence or arouses fear or contempt ('contempt' often implies diminutiveness). Some examples are:

1a) *hakira* lit. "be drunkard of sleeping; deep sleep, etc (§2.4.9 below)": *karā* "to sleep" (§2.4.9 below),

1b) *huḳ'a-tu* "one who inclines or lies down exceedingly" (~ *hak'a-tu*: *haḳa'a* "fall down to the ground"): see §3.4.7 below, *haka'a* expresses a similar meaning (see §2.4.8 below): *ḳa'a* (see §2.4.7 below).

1c) *haṭṭu* "continuous rain whose drops are large" as a vb *haṭala*: *ṭallu* "dew". To my

<sup>89</sup> Old Arab scholars recognized prefixed /h-/ in some words and suffixed /-h/ as performing this function as in *'allāma-h*, *nassāba-h*, etc. (LA radical [h]). Since final /-h/ in such words is natively understood and generally treated as being from an original /-t/ throughout the history of the language in both formal writing and speech, e.g. *'allāma-tu* "one who knows exceedingly", etc., it seems obvious that notion of *exaggeration* comes from doubling the second radical. For more information on this matter, see §2.1.7.3 above.

knowledge, the basic opposition here is between ‘droplets’ of ṭallu and ‘large drops’ of haṭlu

1d) *hilḳāma*-tu “one who eats exceedingly”, orig. one who eats a large bit of food: *luḳma*-tu “a bit of food”

1e) *hibla*’u “glutton” ~ *hulābi*’u, by metathesis, “glutton”: *bala*’a “to swallow food”.

1f) *hamraġa*-tu, *hamraġu* “commotion, disturbance” < *mariġa* “be disturbed” and in the old saying: «*fī (in) harġin wa (and) marġ*», i.e. *in commotion, disturbance*; it is to be noted that [hmrġ] is semantically stronger than [mrġ] (see §2.4.3 below).

1g) *hayġabūsu* “rough and reckless man”, *hanġabūsu* “mean, vile” (both /-y-/ and /-n-/ being inserted for ease of pronunciation) < ġibsu “coward, or weak, and mean man”.

1h) *hanābiṯu* pl. “confused news” < *baṯṯa* “spread news”. Infixes /-nā-/ is the same as /-nā-/ in *sanābilu* pl. “ear of grain”, sg. *sabala*-tu or *sunbula*-tu, BHeb. šbl-t, BAram., Syr. šbl id.

1i) *hunbūḳa*-tu “trumpet, bugle” < *būḳu* id. The /-n-/ has been inserted for ease of pronunciation.

1j) Phoen, Akk. *hbrk* indicating *high official* (NWSI I, 268) < gen. Sem. *brk* “blessed one” (for more examples, see §2.1.6.9 above, ft.<sup>1</sup>).

2) There is no evidence suggesting a signification ‘continuous’ for [h-]. Linguistic evidence supports only the fact as stated above. It is true that there is one or two *arch.* rarely used roots in CA including a semantic feature ‘continuous’ as in *habtu* “continuous beating”; *habata* “to beat, strike”, Akk. *abātu* “to beat, destroy, throw down”, Chad.: Angas *bat*, Sura *bet* “to push, throw down”, Cush.: Oromo *aboota* “give a blow”. But, we cannot build a theory on one example, esp. *in a language like CA*. Moreover, the feature ‘continuous’ may rightly be interpreted here as a sort of ‘exaggeration’ or ‘intensifying’ the meaning of the stem to which it is added.

The following are illustrative examples of compound words having proot /h-/ as their first element. Words having caus. /h-/ are in §§2.4.12, 2.4.13, 2.4.21, perh. 2.4.24, and 2.4.29 below, and the caus. /h-/ in all such words is clearly from an earlier /’-/.

**2.4.1** CA *haġannafu* [r. hġnf], with infixes -n-, “stiff, tough, rude” = *hiġaffu* [r. hġf] id., but its meaning is stronger than *ġāfī* id, Meh. *gəf*, Jib. *geff* “sécher, se dessécher”, etc. (DRS III, 171) = CA [ġf] in *ġāfāf* id. CA has a trilateral [ġnf] as in *ġanafu* “to wrong s.o in judgment and assail with (coarse) words”. It occurred in the Koran (2: 182) with the signification “treating with injustice”: Egyp. *gnf* “to revile, abuse” ~ *gfn* id. (EHD II, 809).

**2.4.2** CA *hama*’a “to flow; to pour”, said of the eyes, “to shed tears” (Al ‘Ayn I, 111; LA) < *mā*’a “to flow”.

**2.4.3** CA *hamraġa* “be confused, disturbed” = *mariġa* id., this is in turn from [raġ], see §2.7.9 above.

**2.4.4** CA *hamaġa*, said of camels, “to drink water and suffer from it”, Te. *hammāgā* “détruire la puissance de”, Jib. *hōg* “réfléchir tristement” (DRS V, 421): CA *maġġa* “to

throw the water out of the mouth” and can also express *the opposite meaning*.

**2.4.5** CA hay‘ara-tu [r. h‘r], ‘ayhara-tu [r. ‘hr] “prostitute”, ‘āhira-tu id. All are from CA ‘āru “shame, disgrace”; ‘ārī “naked”, Phoen. ‘ry “lay bare” (PG, 135), etc. see §2.10.35 below.

a) It may be worth-noting that an etymologically different [‘hr] expresses in Sab. ‘hrw<sup>90</sup> (pl.?) “nobles of the tribe Fays<sup>2</sup>n” (SD, 14) > CA (δū) mu-‘āhir “king of Himyar”. In all other Semitic languages, infixed -h- is rare or nonexistent after /‘-/. The SA word seems to correspond neatly to CA ‘āhil (see §2.5.10, ft. 1 below).

b) In going back to stem [‘ar], we find that BHeb. and CA [‘rm] expresses a caus. meaning “make naked”. The suffix /-m/ is perhaps from an original \*-n, used to form causative verbs from nouns and proper names (see, §3.11 below). The problem with this identification is that the /m/ can also appear as prefix: cf. CA [m‘r] in ma‘ira “to drop hair”, said of the earth, lit. “disappear or die out what covers it of grass and plants”, hence “lay bare”, etc. (§2.10.35 below). For this reason, which can be supported by many other examples, \*m here is neither variant of \*n nor caus. For prefixed m-, see §2.10 below). There are two possibilities: ‘rm is (by metathesis) from ma-‘ar or final -m is a prep.

**2.4.6** CA hata‘a [ht‘] “to beat, strike”, hatta [ht] “to trample upon, crush underfoot, smash, break”, BHeb. hatāt “to break” (OT, 264), CA hataya [hty] id., with m-: CA mata‘a [r. mt‘] “to beat”, etc. are all from a compound of [ha‘] “to beat, strike” as in Egyp. h‘ id. and \*taW- “to beat, stamp upon, crush underfoot, trample upon, break, smash” as in Egyp. tyty id.: ty “to beat, smash, break” (EHD I, 439 & II, 821). The same compound is seen in Egyp. h‘tyh‘ty (by redupl.) “to trample upon” (EHD I, 443).

**2.4.7** CA haqa‘a “to lie down”; huq‘atu “lying down” < ‘aḳ‘ā, caus. of qa‘ā, “to sit (as dogs do)” also, said of a male animal or bird, “to lie on or be atop of the female, as in sexual intercourse”, CVIII ‘ihtaqa‘a, said of a camel, “make a she-camel kneel down or lie down”; haḳi‘a ~ haki‘a, said of a she-camel, “to fall down”, see §2.4.8 below.

The interchange of /ḳ/ and /ḡ/ gave rise to another trilateral [hḡ‘] expressing a similar meaning as in haḡa‘a (see §2.11.50, n. e below).

**2.4.8** CA haka‘a (with -k- for orig. \*ḳ-) “to sleep in a sitting position, to sleep after being tired, be still, at rest”; hukū‘u “sleeping (of a cow)”; hukā‘u, said of a she-camel, “yearning for sexual intercourse” < qa‘ā “to lie, sit” above (see §3.12.28 below).

**2.4.9** CA hakara “to sleep exceedingly, become intoxicated from sleeping”; CV tahakkara “be perplexed, confused; be stunned” = BHeb. taḥkārū “stun” in Job 13:3 (OT, 252). The trilateral is from the root in CA karā “slumber, sleep”, as in the PIP of Labid:

«wa maḡūdīn min ṣubābātī (‘a)l karā» (DL, p. 142, line 1).

<sup>90</sup> As a pl. ending, /-w/ may occur in CA as such under certain syntactic circumstances as in mu‘llimu “teacher” > pl. mu‘allimū, where /-ū/ = /-w/; see §2.9 below, ft. 1, under *Comments*.

**2.4.10** CA *hatkara*, with infixed \*-t-, “to keep on sleeping day and night” < *hakara* < *karā* above. We may note that the word comprises two proots: caus. [ha-] + reflex. [-t-] “self”, and a stem [kar-] “sleep”.

**2.4.11** Ge. *hakaya* “be indolent, tired from too much work”, Te. *hakka*, Tna. *hakäyā* “be lazy, indolent”, Amh. *haket* “laziness, indolence”; *takkätä* “be tired, weary” (DRS V, 407): PHS proot \*kaW- as in Egyp. *k’-t* “work, toil, labor” (EHD II, 784); *nn* (= un-) *k’t* “unemployed, idle, workless” (EHD I, 341)

**2.4.12** Ge. *haymana* “to believe, be faithful”, Syr. *haymen* “to believe, be faithful”, Mand. *haimanuta* “belief, faith”, CA *haiman* [r. hmn] = ’āman, CIV of [’mn] “believe in something, regard it as true”; *muhaiminu* “God, the ever prevalent” as in the Koran (59:23), from *mu’a’minu* (ṢḤḤ V, 2071), which is quite difficult to pronounce; *haimana* = ’a’mana [r. ’mn] “make secure, safe, witness”: PHS stem \*man- (§2.3.35 above).

**2.4.13** Aram.: Targ. *hadar* “to walk around, turn around”, Mand. *hadar* “circuit, turning round”, NHeb. *hādūr* “round” (DRS V, 378; MD, 116) = CA CIV ’adāra “to turn round, to turn”: dāra “to move in a circle, turn round” (§2.2.24, n. a above).

**2.4.14** Akk. *edēpu* “to fly away, blow, inflate”, CA *hadafa* “to hasten”; CIV ’ahdafa “to approach, be near”; *hadafu* “hill of sand, anything huge and high (mountain)”, Aram. *hdp* “to drive, push”, BHeb. *hādap* “to push”, NHeb. *hādūp* “rapid”, Palm. *hadap* “to push”, Te. *hadāfdāfā* “to hasten, hurry” (DRS V, 377-374).

a) CA [df-] covers nearly all meanings expressed by [hdp] in Semitic languages: *daffa*, said of eagle, “to approach or draw near the ground”; CIV ’adaffa, said of eagle, “to flap the wings while it is still on the ground” (\*inflating itself?), *dafdafa* “to hasten, hurry”; *dāfafa* “to push”; *dafdafa-tu* “mountain”; Amh. *tāndāffādāfā* “to flap the wings”, BHeb. *tāpap* “to strike, beat”, e.g. the *tabor* (OT, 1114) = CA *duffu* “drum, tumbrel”; *daffa* “to beat the drum”, Ug. *tp* “drum” (UG, 534), Assy. *duppu* “tablet” (King, 1898: 345). All are based on a stem [dap] “side”, hence CA *dafdafa* “flap the wings” is based on *daffa* lit. “to strike the two sides (of one’s body) with the wings”, i.e. *flap the wings*.

a) To this PHS stem belong, with prefix n-, Sab. *ndf* “to rush” (see §2.11.9 below) and, with prefixed š-, Aram. *šdp* “to drive, pursue” (for an etymologically different [šdf], see §2.2.47 above).

b) Note that CA *daffafa* “to kill” is from a different compound (§2.1.6.5.22 above).

**2.4.15** CA *hudā* “daylight”; *hadā* “to guide”, Sab. *hdy* “guide”, Ge. *hado* “heat (of the noon)”, Mand. *had*, Syr. *haddī* “to guide, direct”, Palm. *hdy* “guide” (DRS V, 374): PHS compound \*hud- “light”, consisting of /h-/ and \*daW- as in Egyp. *dwī* “(the) morning”, Copt. *towī id.* (EG, 602; EHD II, 870), Chad.: *Sumray dawa* “day, sun”, Sibine *dawa id.*, *Tumak taw* “sun”, Kera *dāway* “day” (HSED, n. 664).

**2.4.16** CA *haḡīru* “heat, very hot” also “midday, noon” as in the PIP of Labid:

«rāḥa (ʿa)l qaṭīnu bi-*haḡrin* baʿdamā bakarū...»; mu-hāḡira-tu, haḡru, hāḡira-tu “time of sunset”, and in the fixed expression «ʿatāna ʿalā *haḡrin*», *He came to us after a year or so* (Amāli II, 194; LA, r. hḡr), Meh. hēger “become hot at noon”, Jib. hoger “noon”, Ge. hegore “red color, bright red” (DRS V, 369): PHS stem \*gir- “heat” as in Akk. giru, girru “fire, deity of fire”, Cush.: Saho gira, Afar giraa “fire”, Sid., Darasa., Hadiya, Kambatta giira “fire”, Sid., Hadiya giir- “to burn”, Chad.: Maha girgir, Dera gərgət “hot”, Housa gūra “set fire”, Tera, Bura gərgər “hot” (HSED, n. 930, 931): see §2.2.4 above. This word, as it stands is seen in a number of trilaterals, some of them are:

a) [gyr] in Aram. gīrā “illness” = CA ḡāyyār lit “one who feels a very intense heat in his body” (DRS II, 116). The same trilateral is also seen Egyp. gyr “fire, furnace”, CA ḡāriya-tu fem. “sun”.

b) [ngr], with prefixed caus. n-, as in CA naḡara “to heat (water); heat, thirst” (LA); naḡru “burning, cauterization” (Al ʿayn VI, 107); nāḡiru, see (d) below.

c) [ʿgr], with prefixed caus. ʿ-, as in CA ʿgr = nḡr above. Both nāḡiru and ʿāḡiru are two pre-Islamic names for the two hottest months (LA).

d) By adding a prefixed w- to [ngr], we get CA, dial. wanḡar “kindle a fire, light” (DRS VII, 560), etc.

(e) OffAram. sg. ʿgwr, pl. ʿgrwn “kiln-fired brick”: Akk. agurru (NWSI I, 9).

#### Comments

As we have seen in §2.2.4 above, Sem. šagara expresses “to burn” and consists of a caus. /š-/ and a stem [gir] “heat”. The same stem also appears as \*kir- in Akk. and some other related languages. The CA cognate may be *kīru* “bellows used only to increase the draft to a fire”.

There is still a quadrilateral [sḡhr] in CA ʿasaḡhara “to burn and flame up”, whose meaning is much more intensive than saḡara. The root also expresses “come into view; white”. A question may rise here: *is /h/ an infix?* To the best of my knowledge, it is not and the quadrilateral is a compound of /s-/ plus trilateral [ghr]<sup>91</sup>.

The emphasis on “noon”, i.e. *part of a day*, in the CA and SA words suggests that initial /ha ~ hā/ is a proot, and that all are from a compound of haW- “day” (§2.13.24 below) plus stem [gir] “hot, heat”.

**2.4.17** haḡīnu “girl”, i.e. *woman who marries before reaching puberty*; hāḡīnu “one whose mother is foreign, of mixed origin, hybrid”, hiḡānu, adj., “noble-born, excellent, best, well-bred”; CA haḡana “be/become pregnant” (LA), Jp. hāḡūn, Targ. me-haggan, NHeb. hāḡūn, “appropriate, adapted” (DRS V, 367), Sab. hgn “noble-born” also “son of a slave wife” (SD, 56). All are based on a stem [gan] as in CA CIV ʿaḡanna, said of a woman, “to carry a fetus, be pregnant”; ḡanīnu “fetus”, Cush.: Moča gänne “lady”, Kafa genē “old woman”, Agaw. ganā “mother”, etc. (Müller, 1975: 64, n. 3).

<sup>91</sup> The trilateral is seen in Eth.: Te. gāharä “to shine, sparkle; be incandescent”, Syr. ghr “dimness, lack in sight, blind”, Mand. ghr “dimness” (DRS II, 104; MD, 74), CA ḡahra-tu “open to the eye, manifest; readily seen”; ḡahara “to uncover”; mu-ḡharu “clear, evident”; ʿaḡharu “day-blind, i.e. one who can’t see in the day-light”. For the origin of [ghr], see §2.11.39 below.

As one should expect, a form with initial /k-/ exists in various HS languages as in Berb.: Kabyl , Snus ta-kna, Izayan iken, Chad.: Kariya, Miya kin “co-wife”, Mburku kina, Cagu kine id., Tangale, Kulere kin “sister”: Akk. kinītu “co-wife”, CA kanna-tu “daughter-in-law” (HSED, n. 1513).

**2.4.18** Moab. hrs, said of a town, “destruction”, subst. “ruins” (NWSI I, 293), BHeb. hāras “to pull or tear down, to demolish, to destroy”; subst. “destruction”, Te. haršā, harrāšā “to break, to smash”, CA harasa “to break and pound, to tear in pieces, to lacerate” also “to pound, bruise” (DRS V, 456; OT, 263). All are from a stem \*ras- as in CA rassa “to vitiate, spoil, ruin”, BHeb. rāsas “to break in pieces”, BAram. resas “to pound, to crush” (OT, 985).

The exact meaning of *haras* in SL is *a thing is torn into pieces, pounded or smashed due to something falling upon it, hitting it, or pressing it down*. The presence of other triliterals like CA *harata* ~ *harada* “to tear in pieces” makes it impossible to derive [hrs] from \*ras- unless we assume that its \*-s- is from an earlier \*-θ-.

There is a good possibility that [hrs] is based on [haw] “fall”, and that [-r-] and [-s] are both proots.

**2.4.19** Ug. hmlt “people” (UG, 534), BHeb. hamullāh, hamūllāh “multitude” (DRS V, 423), CA hamlu “copious rain, water pouring fourth copiously”, etc. are from the root in CA mala’u “congregation, people, masses, multitude, crowd”: mala’a “to fill”, Akk. malū, etc. gen. Semitic id. Aram. adds caus. š- as in OffAram. šml’ “to complete”.

**2.4.20** BHeb. hālam “to assemble, bring together, attach”, Mand. hlm id., CA halīmu “attaching to”, Te. halām ’abālā “to take”, Tna. hēlmāt “obscurity, darkness” (DRS V, 417): PHS stem \*lam as in CA lamma “to bring together, assemble”, Chad.: Mubi lamma, Bidiya lum, Migama lumme “to gather” (HSED, n. 1688). SL lamm “gather things, usu. *with the hands*”.

For the Eth. words above: CA lamā “to take all”; ’a-lmā “black, dark”.

**2.4.21** CA haḏafa “to hasten” ~ [’zf] occurs as in ’āzifu “in a hurry”, etc.: see §2.12.22 below.

**2.4.22** Meh. hāgūs, Hars. hegōs, Jib. hogos “réfléchir, penser”; Meh., Hars. hags, Jib. hogs “pensée, idée” (DRS V, 368), CA hāgīsu “a feeling or intuition of what is going to occur” as a vb haḡasa, is undoubtedly from \*gaš- in §2.11.45 below.

a) To the same proot certainly belong CA wāgīsu [wḡs] = hāgīsu; CIV ’awḡasa “to feel; conceive fear” as in the Koran: *وأوجس منهم خيفة*, and *conceived fear of them* (11: 70); waḡsu “hidden voice”, like rikzu (§2.1.9.5, under *Comments*, n. 9 above); wāgīsu = hādisu above; ta-waḡḡasa “listen to a hidden voice” as in Poet. (Thu Rimmah):

«’iḏā ta-waḡḡasa rikzan min sanābikiḥā...» (LA).

Hars. awgōs “ressentir (de la douleur)”, Amh. wāḡāššā “fuir par épouvante (bêtes)” (DRS VI, 494). SL uses hēžis = CA hāgīsu, but the verbal form is *hadas* = CA haḡasa above, Syr. hēdas “penser à, s’occuper de”. It should be remembered here that



interchange of /ġ/ and /d/ is not rare in CA<sup>92</sup>.

b) It seems that CA /r-/ in the n. rikzu is a grammatical prefix just like /w-/ of [wgs], (see §2.1.9.5, n. 9, under *Comments* above), and that [gs] and [kz] are ultimately variants of the same morpheme. Suppose that my view on [gs] & [kz] is correct, it implies that ‘voice’ expresses differences between nouns and verbs. Putting it in different words, it expresses grammatical function, where the voiceless sound marks the noun and its voiced counterpart marks the verb. In some cases, however, we find that the reverse is true: cf. comp. [rgl] “foot”, while [rkl] is the verb denoting “kick, strike with the foot”. Still, there are obvious cases where phonetically different phonemes mark differences between nouns and verbs, not only in CA, but also in sister languages (see §2.17.54, n. 2 below).

**2.4.23** Ug. hgg “to speak” (UG, 536), OAram. hgy “to make a noise”, Targ., Syr. hegā “to meditate, read, pronounce”, BHeb. hāgā “to murmur, mutter, growl, to utter a low rumbling sound”, Poet. “to speak”; hegeh “a muttering, growling, sighing, moaning”, Eth.: Te. tāhaga “to speak”; higa “discourse, language” (DRS V, 364; OT, 242), DA hgy “to say, make noise” (NWSI I, 269), CA haġā “to speak ill of, to attack with satire”; hiġā “spelling; orthography”; haġġā “to spell a word”: PHS proots [ha-] and [ga-] “voice, sound” (§2.11.58 below).

**2.4.24** CA haṭa’a “be humbled, to render submissive” as in Poet.:

«wa Nimru B(i)nu Sa’din lī mu-ṭī’un wa mu-hṭa’u» (Al ‘Ayn I, 101).

The meaning of mu-ṭī’u is in depth the same as its preceding word mu-ṭī’u “obedient”, and its initial /h-/ is from /’-/ , i.e. *one forming CIV caus. stems*: CI ṭā’a, CIV ’aṭā’a.

**2.4.25** Ge. hafawa “être brûlant, en sueur”, haf “chaleur, moiteur”, Te. haf “chaleur” (DRS V. 440), CA hūfu ~ haifu “hot wind, a hot wind coming from Yemen, i.e. *hot south-wind*”; CVIII ’ihtāfa “be thirsty”; hāfu, hayūfu “thirsty” (LA). See §2.2.47 above, esp. n. 7f.

**2.4.26** CA habaṭa “to scatter, spread”: CA baṭṭa, Ug. bṭ “disperser, disséminer, divulguer”, SA bṭ “proclamer” (DRS II, 91). A variant root [bs] exists and is studied in §2.1.6.7, n. 7c above.

**2.4.27** BHeb. hādak “to throw down to the ground, to trample under foot”, CA hadaka “to tear down, esp. *a house*, to destroy”. See §2.1.6.5, n. 3 above.

**2.4.28** Sab. [hwr] expresses two different root meanings: “watercourse” and “rear part” as follows:

a) hwr-t “pool, cistern” also (SD, 57), Egyp. h’r “lake, pond” (EHD I, 442), CA hawru “lake”, perh. a compound of \*hau- “low-lying place” and [wr] “water” as in

---

<sup>92</sup> Some examples are *sidāf* ~ *saġfu* “curtain”, (LA ṣġf), *magah* ~ *badah* “to boast, brag” (LA mġh), but the most common word expressing “boast, brag” is *ta-baġġaḥa* CV of [bġh].

Egyp. wr “lake” (EHD I, 174), Chad.: Miya wər “lake”, Housa wuriya “stream” (HSED, 531).

b) Sab. hwr-t “rear part” = CA warā’u (~ warā) “behind, rear part”, Meh. wurā “return, come or go back”, Chad.: Jegu were, Gudu wura “nape of the neck” (Müller, 1975: 70, n. 90).

**2.4.29** CA haġūlu, hauġalu “fornicator, adulterer”. For its cognates, see §3.2.34 above.

**2.4.30** CA habaġa “to strike with a stick” is from [baġ] in CA baġġa “to stab, pierce with a spear”. It differs from other words expressing “pierce with a spear or thrust with a lance” in that the spear just penetrates into the body without crossing from side to side, Chad.: Housa buga, Angas bak “to beat”, Tumak mbig “to slap”, Cush.: Som. bog id. (HSED, n. 1192). The original signification of [hbg], [bg], [rbg], etc. is “swelling” §2.1.6.7, ft 2 of n. 6b above.

**2.4.31** CA hada’a “to calm down, become calm, become tranquil”, Ge. had’a, Tna. had’e “be calm”, Te. had’a, Amh. da alā “become calm”, SA: Meh. hōdi “calm”, Soq. hodi, Jib. hede’ “become calm” (DRS V, 371-372).

Another trilateral expressing a similar meaning is hadana “to become tranquil, be quiet”; hudna-tu “cessation (of hostilities), truce, tranquility” (Al ‘Ayn IV, 26). The same proot is also seen in ‘itta’ada “be cautious, slow, and gentle (in action)”, i.e. *take one’s time* (in action) *with gentleness*; n. tu-’da-tu.

All are, to my understanding, from a sequence *da da* having to do with ‘walk’, as in SL dā da, said only of a baby *when he begins to learn how to walk* = Heb. diddāh “conduire (un enfant)”, Eth.: Ge. dedaya “commencer à courir (enfant), faire ses premiers pas”, Amh. dadde “premiers pas d’un enfant”, SA: Meh. dādī: dans le langage-bébé, pour faire marcher (DRS III, 223), CA da’da’a-tu “echo resulting from moving an infant in the cradle”, ta-da’da’a “to reel, or sway, in walking”, etc. The stem [da’] is related to that in §2.11.88 below.

**2.4.32** CA hadaġa “to walk slowly, walk in short steps”, Eth.: Te. hadāgdāgā “to trot” (DRS V, 373): CA daġġa “to walk slowly, walk in short steps”, Egyp. dg “to walk, march” (EHD II, 891).

**2.4.33** Aram.: Targ. hōbāda “destruction”; hōbdāna “ruins” (DRS V, 356): see §2.3.3 above.

**2.4.34** CA hāra “to conceive in the mind, guess, conjecture”, Heb. hārā “to conceive in the mind, to mediate, to purpose anything”, BAram. hrr “to conceive in the mind, think”, Syr. harhāra “illusion, mirage” (DRS V, 451). They are from the root in CA ra’ā “to see”. It is also the same root in gen. HS [’mr] (§2.3.6 above), [mr’] (§2.10.11 below), [’r ~ r’] ~ [l’ ~ ’l] (§2.17.2 below), etc. (see §§2.7.11 & 2.7.31 below).

## 2.5 PHS INFIXED /-h-/

Infixed /-h-/ , like prefixed /h-/ , is common in a few CA roots and rare in sister languages. It is possible that it has the same function as prefixed /h-/ above, e.g. *ḡāba* “to disappear, be absent, set (sun)”; *ḡayabā-nu* “anything unexposed to the sun, like *roots of trees or plants*, absence”; *ḡayāba-tu* “bottom” as in the Koran: (والقوه في غيابة الجب), *in the bottom of the well* (12:10).

Infixing -h- in the word gives rise to a new root expressing, as in *ḡayhabu*, “excessive darkness”. As for the notion “be absent”: cf. *ḡahiba* “to miss, forget” (Al ‘Ayn III, 360-361; ŞHĤ I, 196; LA); *ḡahib-tu* = *ḡafal-tu* “I forgot” (Al ‘Ayn III, 361)<sup>93</sup>.

2a) Similarly, *ḡaḡḡu* “swift (i.e. a dark-colored bird)”, while *ḡayhaḡu* “crow”, which is the most famous of all birds as being dark-colored and of ill or evil omen. It is indeed so famous in Arabic culture to such an extent that HS stem [ḡaḡḡ-] “darkness” as in Egyp. ḡḡḡ-t id. (EHD II, 778) has been preserved in CA by *ḡaḡaḡa-tu* pl. “domestic crow”.

The following are illustrative examples of medial /-h-/ performing the same function:

**2.5.1** CA *ḡumhūru* “majority of people” also “masses, multitude, crowd” < *ḡamra-tu* “tribe” also “one thousand horsemen”. As verbs, *ḡamara* express “to gather, assemble” while *ḡamhara* “to gather or assemble in multitude”, Akk. *ḡāmaru* “full, complete” (AG, 74), Ug. *t-gmr* “totality” (UG, 536), Nab. *m-gmr* “totality” (NWSI, II, 593): PHS stem \**gam-* “be full” as in CA *ḡamma* “be very much, many, to heap up”; *ḡamāmu* “to the fullest extent”; *ḡammu* “much/many, multitude, abundance, full”.

**2.5.2** CA *lahasa* [r. lhs] “to lap”; *lāhasa* “to seek to eat at the expense of others”, *lahsama* [r. lhsm] “to eat all what is on the table” < *lassa* “to eat”.

**2.5.3** CA *ḡuhdu* “effort”; *ḡahada* “to exert oneself”; *ḡāhada* “to strive, struggle”, NSyr. *ḡāid* “to exert effort” (DRS II, 103) < CA *ḡadda* “to exert oneself, strive”.

**2.5.4** CA *waharu* “widespread heat (of the sun)”, in OYem. “heat waves of the sun” (LA). It is possible that the word is a sort of blend of \**war* and \**har*: CA *’uwwāru* “intense heat (of the sun or fire) and thirst, smoke and flame” < *war-* as in CA *warra* “to kindle a fire”, Egyp. *wr* “fire, flame”, Chad.: *Zime wor* “to roast” (see §2.17.1, esp. n. 1 below).

**2.5.5** CA *dahyā’u* “calamity”, NHeb. *dāhah* “be pale, faint”, Aram.: Jp. *dīhā* id., Hars. *dāhyeh* “disaster”, etc. (DRS III, 226): CA *dā’u* “illness”, Ug. *dw* “ill”, etc.

<sup>93</sup> To my understanding, *ḡafala*, which also expresses “fall asleep, leave out, forget”, is a compound of stem *ḡafā* [ḡfy or ḡfw] “to take a nap, doze” + \*-l. Prefixing h- to [ḡf] coupled with a change of both the order of its radicals and /f/ > /b/ does not seem to affect the meaning: *habaḡa* “to sleep (usu. in the daylight)”; *hubūyu* “sleeping” (Al ‘Ayn III, 360). There are still trilaterals belonging to such stems, e.g. *ta-ḡfīḡu* “sleep”.

**2.5.6** CA 'ayhaka-tu, 'awhaka-tu "fight" < 'akka "to strike, prevent" (§2.10.24 below).

**2.5.7** CA wahaġu "heat"; wahaġa, tawahhaġa "to incandesce, glow intensely, burn with flame"; Te. wāhagā "to sweat" (DRS VI, 509), perh. a blend of [wag] and [ʿag]. The first element is seen in CA waġġa "to blaze, burn with a flame" (the meaning of wahaġa-t, CV ta-wahhaġa-t, said of a fire, is much stronger than that of waġġa-t), Egyp. wg "to burn" (HED I, 187), Ge. wagga, wagaga "to burn", Te. wāg bela "to burn, to flash, sparkle", Tna., Amh. wāgāgta "dawn", etc. (DRS VI, 490).

1) Besides the word [waġ], PHS also had a word [ʿaġ] as in [ʿag] "to burn, to kindle a fire; fire" as in CA ʿaġġa "to flame up a fire"; CVIII ʿiʿtaġġa "to incandesce, glow intensely"; ʿaġīġu, ʿaġġa-tu "intense heat", Akk. agāgu "être enflame, être en colère" (DRS I, 6), Assy. aggu "angry, furious" (King, 1898: 318), Tham. ʿg "to burn" (Branden, 1950: 511), Chad.: Migama ʿiggo "to burn", Rift yogo "fire", Ndam yuga id. (DRS VI, 509; HSED, n. 129), with n-ext.: Ug. ʿgn "fire" (UG, 532).

2) With the usual interchange of /ʾ-/ and /h-/: BHeb. \*hāgag obsol. "to burn, be hot", hence הָגַג "heat, fervor of the mind" (OT, 242), CA haġġa "flamber (flamme)"; haġīġu "ardeur de feu", SA: Jib. āhgeg "faire une grande lueur de flamme, un grand éclair", Eth.: Tna. haġāgā "fumer (feu)" (DRS V, 364).

3) To PHS \*ʿag- belong, with m-ext.: CA taʿaġġama CV of [ʿġm], said of fire, = taʿaġġaġa CV of [ʿġġ] above "to glow intensely, burn with a flame, flame up a fire"; said of the day "become very hot"; said of a person, "be angry, inflamed" = Akk. agāmu, etc. see §2.3.36 above.

4) A prefix w- can be added to [gm] to form a trilateral [wgm], deriving into a subst. waġīmu as in yaumun (= day) waġīmun "hot day".

5) Egyp. mg' "fireplace, oven, fire" is from [m-] "place" plus ʿag, and mʿgʿr id. (EHD I, 290), from [m-] + [ʿg] + [ʿr]. For [ʿr], see §2.2.56.1.3 above.

The root under study, i.e. [ʿag], will also be dealt with in §2.12.25, esp. n. b below.

6) A root [ʿag II] expresses "haste, rapidity" as in Tham. wg "aller vite", Chad.: Ndam. wuga "courir": CA waġġu "haste, rapidity, speed", hence wuġuġu pl. "fast or rapid ostrich (or sand-grouse?)" as in the PIP of ʿarfah:

«wa maṣat baina (ʿal) ḥašāyā mašya waġġu» (LA).

All seem to be from the root in CA ʿaġġa "to hurry, hasten". It seems that waġġu in the line of Poet. above is variant or an earlier form of wazzu pl. of wazza-tu fem. "goose" (gen. Sem. id.).

**2.5.9** CA rawāhiṣu "immovable and firmly fixed (said of rocks/stones)": ruhiṣa, said of a wall about to fall, "be properly propped"; raḥṣu "basis of a structure"; rahaṣa "make firm, solid": PHS stem \*raṣ-, in CA raṣṣa, raṣā "make firm, press firmly" as in the Koran (61: 4): (كَانَهِمْ بَنِيَانٌ مَرْصُوصٌ), BHeb. rṣṣ "oppress, crush" (Ryder, 1974: 117), with n-ext.: Assy. ruṣṣunu "be firm, solid, dignified", CA raṣuna "be firmly established, be firm, staid"; raṣīnu "ponderous, weighty; sedate, unruffled, staid, serious, firm" (= razīnu adj., razuna vb., BHeb. razan, etc. below are variants), raṣana "make perfect, strengthen" as in the PIP of Labid:

«...raṣanat duhūra rawāġibin wa banāni»

CA *razana* "to weigh, balance in the hand(s) in order to guess the weight of" (see *Comments* below), Har. *rēzāna* "be heavy, be serious"; *razīn* "heavy", Tna. *rāzānā* "be heavy, exceed the measure", Te. *rāzna* "be heavy" and *rāzma* "load heavily" (HED, 135). The same stem is also seen with initial /t-/ in §2.7.13 below.

#### *Comments*

a) Instead of CA *razana* "to balance in the hand in order to know the weight of (a thing)" above, Leb., including SL, has only *rāz* to express this meaning, from [rwz]. This triliteral exists in CA and expresses the same meaning expressed by *razana*. It also applies to 'mind', hence *rāza* "to know by trial, to experience, to test": comp. CA *wazana*, "to weight"; *mīzānu* "a balance", Ug. m-zn-m pl. id. (UG, 530). A possible Egyp. cognate is 'wsw "balance"

b) Te. *rāzma* above = SL *ruzmē* (from CA *rizma-tu*) "articles, clothes, etc. *fastened or wrapped together* (very similar to 'bale', but CA 'ibāla-tu is confined to *a bale of grass*"); CA *razama* "to wrap together, to pack up" (see §§2.12.16 & 2.15.16 below).

**2.5.10** Ug. 'hl "tent" (i.e. 'home', 'family')" (UG, 536), Phoen. 'hl id. (PG, 75), BHeb. 'ōhel id. (Ryder, 1974: 123), CA 'ahlu "family, clan", Tham. 'hl "tent, family, tribe" (Branden, 1950: 511), Sab. 'hl "folk, people, community" (SD, 3), Egyp. yhīr "camel's hair tent". All are partly related to ['awal] as in CA 'ālu "family"<sup>94</sup>, Tham. 'l "tribe, tent" (Branden *ibid.*), Ug. yl "kinsman" (UG, 535). See §§2.1.14. 2 above, 2.17.26, n. 2b below, etc.

To many old Arab scholars both 'ālu (from \*'a'alu) and 'ahlu signify "family, clan, household" are variants of one word. They argue that the diminutive form of 'āl (i.e. \*'a'al) is 'uhail (comp. *ġabal* "mountain", dimin. *ġubail*) with the second hamzah /-'-/ changed into /-h-/ (see LA, roots 'wl and 'hl). It is impossible to use diminutiveness as a basis for determining the origin of a noun.

To my understanding, there is a difference in meaning between them: 'āl signifies "members of a family related through blood relationship and descending from one remote ancestor", while 'ahl expresses "family, including close and distant relatives, parent" also "people", i.e. *those live in the same place, whether it is a house, town or city*. Based on this understanding, the word is a compound of ['ah] + 'al above. The first element of the compound is in Egyp. yhī "camp" also "house" as in yhī n yw' "house for cattle" ~ h-w pl. "belongings, household, relatives" ~ hy "to copulate" = CA 'hl in ta-'ahhala "to marry"<sup>95</sup>.

**2.5.11** CA *dahaḡa* "to press down heavily", cut into pieces and crush" (see §2.1.6.5.1, esp. n. 2a & n. 2b above).

<sup>94</sup> CA 'ā'ila-tu *fem.* "family", orig. "a large or great family" and is a compound of proot 'a' (see §2.15) and 'āl above. Similarly, 'āhil "monarch, king" includes the same proot.

<sup>95</sup> All what I want to add here is that the word ['wl] is most likely a compound of ['aw], ult. the same as that expressing "human being, to be, house". As for /-l/, it is most likely the same /-l/ in CA bawlu "son", etc.

**2.5.12** BHeb. *dāhar* "to move swiftly, to press on rapidly" also "to revolve in a circle"; *dāharā* "rapid course of a horse" (OT, 216) is perh. from the root in CA *dāra* "to turn round, move in a circle", *darra* "to run", etc. (see §2.2.24, esp. n. a above), or from /da'/ "cause" and [har] as in CA *harra* "run, flee".

**2.5.13** EHeb. *dhm* "remain silent" (NWSI I, 242): BHeb. *dāmā* "be silent, dumb" (OT, 228).

**2.5.14** CA [khs] in *yata-ḵahwasu* "be humpbacked" is, according to Bin Faris (ML V, 36), from *yata-ḵauwasu* id. (see §2.9.20 below).

**2.5.15** Sab. *nhk* "cause to damage, inflict damage on" (SD, 94), CA *nahaka* "to exhaust the strength of, to wear out"; CIV *'anhaka* "to sap, undermine, to inflict damage on, to tire out"; *'intahaka* "to violate, to abuse", etc. The /-h-/ here is plainly an infix, and the trilateral is from a PHS base *\*nak-*. By the adoption of various suffixes or proots as part of the root, the form *\*nak-* gave rise to a large number of trilaterals expressing various shades of the same idea. Some of such trilaterals are:

a) Sab. *nky*, *nkyt* "mischief"; *nky* "mischievous, spiteful person" (SD, 96), BHeb. *nākāh* "to strike, to smite" (OT, 671), CA *nakā* "to wound and kill (enemies), to spite, to inflict damage on"; *nikāya-tu* "out of spite", Ge. *nākāya* "to hurt", Te. *nākka* "hit a wound", Amh. *nākka* "to touch, hurt", Har. *nākā'a* "to touch, to harm", etc. (HED, 118).

b) BHeb. *nākā* "to beat, to smite"; *nākē* "afflicted", OAram. *nkh* "to beat, strike, hit" (NWSI II, 730; OT, 671), CA *naka'a* = *nākā* in meaning, but it is also the term used in the language to express "to remove the scab of a wound", hence *to hurt*, *to injure*; in a proverb: «...*lā tunka'* ~ ...*lā tunkah*», where *tu-nka'* ~ *tu-nkah* = "ache; pain", Eth.: Ge. *nākāyā* "hurt", Har. *nākā'a* "touch, harm", Te. *nākka* "hit a wound", Tna. *nāx'e* "touch", Amh. *nākka* "touch, hurt", Z. *nākā* "touch" (HED, 118).

c) Akk. *nakālu* "to deceive, play a trick", BHeb. *nākal* "to deceive, to deal fraudulently", EHeb. *nkl* "evil", BAram., Syr. *nkl* id. (OT, 673, NWSI II, 731). False cognates are CA *nakkala* "to mutilate, to punish severely", Egyp. *nkn* "cause evil, harm, damage". Akk., Aram., Hebr. [n-kl] = CA [d-gl] §3.1.6.5.9, n. a above.

In addition, CA *naka'a* "to beat, to strike, to smite", *nakaba* "to afflict with calamity", *naknaka* [r. nk] "to press down, suppress (an enemy)", and so forth: PHS stem *\*n-Wk-* consists of *\*n-* and a proot *\*Wk-* as in Egyp. *nyk* "to punish".

## 2.6 PHS Proot /y-/

In Phoenician, /y-/ is added to verbs to express a causative meaning. In this respect, Phoen. y- = CA, etc. ' - = Akk., Ug., etc. š- = Heb., Sab., etc. h- (Moscatti, 1969: §16.13). What follows is a suggestive sketch of the major functions and significations of the affix /y/ in HS languages.

1) As a prefix, /y-/ is used in some Semitic languages to form nouns and adjectives from verbs, nouns, and adjectives, as in CA ya'fūru "buck", so-called from the color of 'earth'; yaḥmūmu "black smoke" ('aḥammu "black"); ya'būbu "stream with copious water" ('ūbābu "copious water"; 'abba, 'a'abba "to drink", BHeb. yaḥmūr "a kind of deer", Syr. yaḥmūrā, CA yaḥmūru (BHeb., CA ḥmr "be red"), CA yanbū'u "fountain" (nab'u "fountain, source"); yahyaru "a kind of stone" (perh. from hr "mountain"), etc. (Wright, 1966:182, Moscati, 1969: §12.15). This /y-/ must be distinguished from /y-/ as in Akk. yaraḫānu "a certain type of garden herb" = CA yaraḫānu "a plant disease", both are from [wrḫ] "verdure, green, vegetables, etc."

1a) The original meaning of the prefix in the examples above is "belonging to", later, also has come to express "having the characteristic of, like". Accordingly, it could be historically identical in function and meaning with the Semitic suffix \*-y-, called *ياء النسبة* in Arabic, i.e. *belonging to, coming from also one who/that is* as in CA 'irāḫiy or 'irāḫī "Iraqi", i.e. *belonging to Iraq*, ḫarya-tu "village" > ḫarawiyu (ḫarawī) "villager", ḫahabiy "golden" (ḫahabu "gold"), ḫaṣabiy "wooden" (ḫaṣabu "wood"), etc., Akk. mahrū < mahriyu "first", Phoen. ṣdny "Sidonian" (ṣdn "Sidon"), ṣry "Tyrian" (ṣr "Tyre"), BHeb. ṣōrī "Tyrian". The suffix is also found in Egyp. ḥmw-ty "artist" from ḥmw-t "art" (Moscatti, 1969: §12.23.c; Gray, 1971: §175; PG, 142).

1b) In some cases, however, the prefix is added to nouns and may express in CA "much, many" as in yanbū'u above: nab'u "spring, source (of water)", yaḥdūru, said of the earth, "much green" (ḥdr "green"), ya'būbu "stream with much water" ('bb "water" above), yahyarru "much water", etc.

1c) The prefix is also used in place-names as in CA yabrīnu (from barā "dust"), yaṯribu, yaynu, yūnu, yihābu (names of cities and towns in Arabia), yalyalu "name of a mountain", yasūmu id. (from samā "to rise high"; sumuw "height, elevation, loftiness"), yaman "Yemen", yabatu "valley in Yemen", yubnā "city in Palestine" = BHeb. yabneh id. (from bny "to build"), BHeb. Yabesh "city in Gilead" (from BHeb. ybš "(be dry" = CA ybs id.), Yapō, CA Yāfa, Phoen. ypy "Jaffa", i.e. the beautiful, the splendid. In many of such place-names /'-/ interchanges position with /y-/ in CA. Some additional examples are yalamlamu ~ 'alamlamu "place-name", yanādīdu ~ 'anādīdu "scattered", yaṯribiy ~ 'aṯribiy "belonging to Yaṯribu", yalalu ~ 'alalu, etc. See Amāli II, 160.

1d) The prefix may also be used in CA to form nouns and proper names from verbs. But, since ya- = 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. masc. sg. of the imperfect, the combination may often express the present tense, hence yalma'u "mirage" also "it flashes", yarma'u "flashing or glittering white stones" also "it glitters" (lm' ~ rm' "to glitter"), yazīdu pers. name Yazid also "he adds" (zāda "to add"), ya'muru pers. name Ya'mor, from [mr] "to build, to live long", yaškuru pers. name Yashkor also "he thanks" (šakara "to thank"), and so on. O'Leary (1969: §112) finds that «such a performative seems to occur in proper names which were originally sentences as يَشْكُر and يَقْدِم etc., or in BHeb. which commenced with the name of God...». This particular type of derivation is no longer productive in

CA, and it appears that the original signification of the prefix is *one who*, etc. above = Egypt. *y* “he who, that which”.

The method of forming proper names by prefixing *\*ya-* is also found in other Semitic languages as in BHeb. *yīṣḥāq* “Isaac” (> CA *’iṣḥāq*), i.e. “he (= *yi*) laughs”, from *ṣāḥaq* “to laugh” (= CA *ya-ḏḥaku* “he laughs”, Ug. *ṣḥk* ~ *ḏḥk* “to laugh” (UG, 533), etc.

2) As an *infix*, */-y-/* serves as a diminutive element and consistently occurs after the second radical as in CA *’ummu* “mother” > *’umayma-tu*, *bintu* “daughter” > *bunaiya-tu*, *binu* “son” > *bunaiyu*, *kitābu* “book” > *kutaiyibu*; *baḥru* “sea” > *buḥaira-tu* “lake”<sup>96</sup>, etc. (Sibawayhi’s *Kitab* II, 105ff), JAram. bryh *diminutive* of brh “daughter”: br “son” (NWS II, 198).

3) Returning to the prefix */y-/*, it is also seen in Ug. in such words as *ybn* “son” and *ybnt* “daughter” which corresponds to CA *’bn* and *’bnt* respectively. It should be noted that both Ug. and CA, like other Semitic languages, have forms without initial semivowel */y/* or */ʔ/*: Ug. *bn* “son” = CA *bn* (*binu*, Akk. *binu*) id., Ug. *bt* (*\*bnt*) “daughter” = CA *bnt* (*bintu*, Akk. *bintu*) id. For the Ug. words, see UG, 535. It is evident that Ug. */y-/* and CA */ʔ-/* are allomorphs of the same morpheme.

4) We have already pointed out in §2.3.25 above that, in some Semitic trilaterals, a derived word may not occur without an initial */ʔ-/*. In this case, the glottal stop acts as a part of the root, though, in fact, it is not. The following examples illustrate this fact:

4a) [r. *ṣb’*] as in Ug. *uṣb’t* “finger”, CA *’uṣba’u* id., pl. *’aṣābi’u*; dual *’u-/’iṣba’ān*, etc. gen. HS: see §2.1.10, n. 7 above.

4b) [r. *rb’*] as in Akk. *’arba’u* “four”, CA *’arba’u*, Eth. *’arbā’*, BHeb., Syr. *’arba’* id. (Gray, 1971: §153), Sab. *’rb’* (SD, 113). With the exception of *rub’u* “¼” (Ug., SAb., BHeb. *rb’* id.) and the ordinal *rābi’u* “fourth” (Akk. *rebū*, Sab. *rb’* id.), */ʔ-/* is seen in all other numerals involving “four” as in CA *’arba’ata* *’ašara* “14” (Syr. *’arbēta* *’sar* id.); *’arba’ūna* “40” (Assyr. *irbā*, Sab. *’rb’y* id., Moab. *’rb’n* id.); *’arba’u mi’at-* “400”, *’arba’ātu* “fours”, dual *’arba’atāni*, etc. There is no doubt that initial */ʔ-/* in such words originally had a meaning. What that meaning was we have so far no way of knowing. One good possibility is that *\*ʔ-* was *’Aleḥ waṣl’* (see §3.3.19 above), or that it came to some singulars from their broken (or internal) plural forms. Let us see how such plurals are formed in CA.

*ḥafīdu* “grandson” > pl. *’aḥfādu*,

*ḡīlu* “generation” > pl. *’aḡyālu*,

*ḥimlu* “load” > pl. *’aḥmālu*,

*\*sm* (*’sm*: see §3.3.19 above) “name” > pl. *’asmā’u*,

*\*ṣb’* “finger” > pl. *’aṣābi’u*,

*\*f’y* (*’af’ā*: see §3.3.25 above) “viper, serpent” > pl. *’afā’ī*.

5) On the other hand, the initial */ʔ-/* of BHeb. *’ezrō’a* “the arm”, BAram. *’edrā’* “arm” (Rosenthal, 1963: 76) *must be from either*:

5a) *’aḏru’u*, the broken plural of Semitic [ḏirā’] “arm” as in CA *ḏirā’u* (pl. *’aḏru’u*), Akk. *zurū*, etc. id. (Gray, 1971: §52), Ug. *ḏr’* id. (UG, 531).

5b) The definite article (*’a*) assimilates completely to the following consonant if it is

<sup>96</sup> This example shows that *deminutivum* has introduced a new word into the language.



dental, alveolar, etc. (see §2.19, n. 5a below) as in zarāfa-tu pl. “giraffe” > ’az-zrāfa-tu “the giraffe”, dār “house” > ’ad-dār “the house”.

6) To sum up, I reiterate my view that Sem. \*y- is linguistically identical with the suffix \*-y. I have assigned to this affix a number of meanings such as “one who/which (does/is/deals with = agentive prefix), belonging to, source from”<sup>97</sup>. As pointed out above, all such meanings are actually expressed by the suffix -y, nom. pl. -yū-n. For example, the addition of the suffix -y to CA fahharu “earthenware” (= Akk. p̄hr, Aram. p̄hr, etc. id.) yields fahhāriy, which expresses the following meanings: “potter” also “one who sells/makes/deals with earthenware pots and other vessels” and “belonging to or made of fahhāru” as the context seems to require. This is the same as Egyp. [y] above, which also expresses “he who, that which” besides “O” = CA yā “O”, also used to express ‘exclamation’, i.e. *oh* = Pun. y’, DA y, OffAram. yh id. (NWSI I, 430). It is most likely that [r] (§2.1.6.7 above) and [y] go back to one original form \*yar, which was later split into two proots [r] and [y] (see §2.15 below).

7) There is still another important grammatical function of /-y/ “belonging to” so crucial for a student of HS to know. It is ultimately the very same /-y/ in n. 1a above. It serves to form substances from nouns. The substances may be used as nouns (see n. 1a above) or adjectives. In many cases the meaning of the derived substance is the sum total of the meanings of its two parts as in CA yinā “richness” > yaniy “rich”, i.e. lit. *belonging to yinā* as Amerikī or Amerikiy “American” = belonging to America. In some other cases, however, it is not. For example, CA dūrī “sparrow” has etymologically nothing to do with ‘birds’ and consists of dūr “houses”, i.e. *the pl. of dār* “house”, and -y “belonging to”.

8) Outside Phoen., prefixed y- is occasionally found in other Semitic languages, including Phoen., as part of the root, and expressing a causative meaning. Examples given below cover a number of different /y’s/.

**3.6.1** CA ya’āṭī “yelling at a wolf/camel or in a war” < ’īṭu [’yṭ] “shouting, calling, yelling” = ’aṭ’aṭa-tu [’ṭ’ṭ] “shouting or yelling repeatedly”, ’aiyaṭa “to shout, yell”. Ibin Barri quoted M. Bin Habib as saying: «*the origin of this form is ’āṭi (’āṭi), then yā- {meaning “O”, as in Hear us, O Lord, was prefixed to it after the shortening of its /ā/ for ease of pronunciation, becoming ya’āṭi}*» (LA, r. y’ṭ). In SL and other dialects the same trilateral is never used with /y-/ and occurs only in CII ’aiyaṭ “to shout or yell at, to call”, and by repeating 1<sup>st</sup> radical in reduplication: ’ai’aṭ “shout repeatedly”. It is most likely that final \*-ṭ is a suffix from an earlier /-t/ (§2.9 above), and that the real proot is [’ay], a variant of [’aw] (see §2.23.10, n. 4f below).

Bin Habib’s view on the origin of /y-/ makes the trilateral a compound of [ya-] “O, a vocative particle” (= Egyp. y id.) and \*’aṭ. The particle [ya-] has been semantically extended to “call, say” in various Chadic and Cushitic languages as in Chad.: Pero yo,

<sup>97</sup> For different morphological functions performed by /’-/ , see O’Leary, 1969:§113, and for a different view on the origin of y-, see Wright *ibid.*

Gabri ye, Gudu 'ya “call”, Cush.: Saho ya-, ii- “say”, Afar ii-, iiy-, Som. ii-, Oromo iyya, Sid. i-, y-, Xamir yi-, y-, etc. (HSED, n. 2564).

#### Comments

Final [-ṭ] and [-d] are proots suffixed to earlier biliteral stems and do not add to my knowledge of such stem meanings any important information other than turning a substance into another substance, into a verb, or vice-versa. Putting it in other words, the general signification of the stem is quite obvious without them. Reconsider the following examples:

- a) faraṭ “dismantle” ~ farr id. (§2.21.6.4 below);
- b) Sab., Ge. wft “burn” ~ wf id. (§2.2.47, n. 7d above);
- c) CA fā'ida-tu “interest, benefit”; fāda *caus.* “make benefit” ~ fai’ “tax” (§2.12.15, n. 3 below);
- d) CA msd ~ s'd “move *at night*” ~ suy “night” (§2.1.6.5.23-24 above);
- e) CA f'd ~ dff ~ dwf “kill” ~ wafā-tu “death”; ta-waffa, etc. (§2.1.6.5.22 above).

It seems that in most cases the suffixes /-d, -ṭ/ are from /-t/ (see §3.9 above), e.g. (SL) *faraṭ* or *farat* (n. a above) is from the noun *far-t* “dismantling” and CA *fā'ida-tu* (n. c above) is from a noun \*fay-tu or \*fa'-tu. In few or rare cases, the suffixes *may possibly be* from HS historical [da'] “cause, make” as in n. e above, and its occurrence in final position *may be* due to metathesis.

On the other hand, Egyp. final /-ṭ/ and /-d/ are often in free variation, e.g. ft ~ fd “to feel disgust or nausea” = SL *tfu* or *tfih*, a compound of /t-/ and [fu or fih], used to express *this feeling* and ‘*spitting*’: see §2.7.5, esp. n. 10.

2.6.2 CA r. [yr'] derives into:

- 1) yarā'u “shepherd's flute or clarinet” is related to rā'ī “a shepherd”.
- 2) yarū'u in old Šaḥar dialect “fright, dismay” < rā'a “to frighten” (LA, r. yr'): PHS stem \*ra'-, see §2.12.27 below.
- 3) yarā'u “glow-worm, firefly”; yarā'a-tu = a bird, which *when it flies in the day-light, it is like any other bird, but when it flies at night, it looks like a meteor or a flying lamp*.

**2.6.3** CA yafanu “old man” < fāni “perished”: faniya, “to perish”; CIV 'afnā “to perish, annihilate, consume, exhaust”, Palm. pny “to empty” (NWSI II, 920). Some old Arab scholars assert that *yafanu* is formed from [fan-]: stem {yaF'aLu}, *as if the passage of time, said of a man, fanna-hu and 'ablā-hu, i.e. caused him (= -hu) to perish* (Al 'Ayn VIII, 377; LA).

**2.6.4** CA yanamu “a kind of grass that fatten camels” < namā, said of she-camels, “to become fat”: namā “to grow”; namā'u “growth”, Tham. nmy “prosperity, increase” (Branden, 1950: 515). The triliteral [nmy] is ultimately from ma'ā, said of trees, “(begin) to shoot out (leaves)”: mā' “water”.

**2.6.5** CA yūḥu (r. ywḥ) “the sun” > waḥā “fire”. For a deep study of the proot, along with many derivative triliterals, see §2.13.24, esp. n. 4 below.

**2.6.6** CA yahmā'u "desert without any mark or trace that can be used as a guide" < hāma "to roam aimlessly, wander".

**2.6.7** CA ya'isa "to despair, be hopeless" (Koran 5: 2; 29: 23; 12: 80; 12: 110, etc.); ya'su, ya'āsa-tu "despair, desperation", BHeb. [r. y'š] as in nō'aš with prep. ʾp "to despair of and desist from" (= CA ya'isa with the same prep. *min* id.); nō'āš "one in despair" (OT, 371) = CA yā'isu id. < CA 'asā "grief, sorrow"; ma-'sā-tu "tragedy"; mu-'sī "tragic".

**2.6.8** CA ya'isa expresses two distinct meanings; one "to despair" above and the other "to know" as in 'a lam ta-y'as "don't you know" (ML VI, 153) and in the Koran: أفلم يبين الذين آمنوا أن لو يشاء الله لهدى الناس جميعا *Have not those who believe yet known that if God wills He would certainly guide all the people?* (13:31). This particular meaning of [y's] is certainly a survival from PHS \*-s-, seen in Egyp. s ~ s' "to know", sw n id.; s'-t "knowledge; wisdom"; s'w "wise man" (EHD II, 583, 634), Berb.: Tua essen, Kabyl issin "to know", Chad.: Housa sani, šina "to know", Cagu, Miya, Jimbbin, Logone, Kariya, Daba sun- Warji sən, Mbu sin "to know", Ndam asine, Mobu asəne "to know", Margi sini "to remember", Oromo seenaa "memory" (HSED, n. 2294, 2198).

**2.13.9** CA yalaḳu "white", lahaḳu<sup>98</sup> id.; ta-'allaḳa "to glitter, or flash, and shine", Assyr. alāḳu "to shine", Mand. aliḳa "flame" (MD, 19). For other initial radicals added to stem \*-laḳ, see §2.1.6.5.10 above.

**2.6.10** Ug. ynḳ id. (UG, 536), OAram. ynḳ "to suck, nurse", OffAram. ynḳ "to suck, suckle" NWSI, I, 461), BHeb. yānaḳ "to suck": PHS stem \*naḳ- "to suck, suckle" as in Egyp. nḳw-t "liquid"; caus. s-nḳ "to suckle" (EHD II, 678), CA naḳā "to suck marrow from bone", and with interchange between /-n/ and /-m-/: maḳā [r. mḳy] "to suck", also [r. mḳḳ]: Class II maḳḳa, CVIII 'imtaḳḳa "to suck"; maḳḳaḳa-tu "suckling kid" = OffAram. ynḳ "small child, child", Akk. yanāḳu "lamb" (NWSI, I, 462), Chad.: Warji nəḳə "to lick", Kariya nəḳə id., Mbara nik id. The stem is also present in Akk. naḳū "to pour out", Ometo: Ari noka, noḳa "water", Banna nooḳo, Karo nuḳo id. (HSED, n. 1872, 1881), Cush.: \*nuuk- "to suck in" (RPAA, n. 620).

1) As one may note, all evidence cited above leaves no choice but to reconstruct a PHS proot \*naḳ- "to suck, suckle". My unwavering belief, however, is that n-, like m- (§2.10), is a prefix. Moreover, I may accept a stem \*maḳ- signifying "to suck", but never \*naḳ-, unless it is a compound of reflex. \*n- + \*-ḳ-.

2) The three strict conditions for which I accept or reject a proot has already been spelled out in §2.2.55 above, under *Comments*. Accordingly, the presence of \*naḳ

<sup>98</sup> CA yaḳaḳu "intensely white", mahaḳu ~ muḳa-tu "intensely white, white-blue", bahaḳu "whiteness in the skin", bihliḳu "intensely red", balaḳu "black and white", yaḳaḳu "white goats", yalaḳ ~ lahaḳ = yaḳaḳ, etc.

“suck” in the entire Hamito-Semitic languages is never sufficient evidence.

There are indeed roots furnishing evidence against the reconstruction of \*naḵ. One of which is Ug. pwḵ “to drink”, CA fwḵ (see §2.11.29, n. 4 below), which is a compound of \*pw- and \*-ḵ- “water, liquid”. Another example is SL la’ (from laḵḵ) “to lick (any liquid, esp. *water*) with the tongue (as dogs and other animals do)”, from [l-] “tongue” (§§2.17.41-53 below) and -Wḵ- “water”. The latter element is perhaps = Egyp. yḵ “a kind of drink” (HED II, 92).

**2.6.11** CA yanbūtu, a quadriliteral in LA, but a derivative of [nbt] elsewhere (e.g. ŠHH I, 268), “a kind of plants” as in the PIP of Nabīyah:

«yamudduhu kullu wādin muzbidin laḡibin

fīhi ḥuṭāmūn min (’a)l yanbūti wa (’a)l ḥaḍadi» (ŠM, p. 97, L. 46),

< nabtu coll. “plant”, pl. of the coll. nabātu; nabata “to grow” < nabātu: BHeb. nūb “to sprout, germinate”, said of wealth, “to grow” (OT, 655). Albright (JAOS 47, 1927: 219, n. 47) connects *nab-* with *nam-* (see §3.6.4 above) and derives the former from the latter.

**2.6.12** Phoen. ytm “fatherless” (PG, 108), Ug. ytm “orphan” (UG, 534), BHeb. yatōm id. (OT, 438), CA yatīmu (for human beings) “fatherless” and (for animals) “motherless”, in the Koran “orphan” (6:152, 17:34, 93:9, etc.)<sup>99</sup>. Among other CA terms for human beings are laṭīmu “fatherless & motherless”.

a) Semitic ytm is perh. cognate with Egyp. ytm “without, not”, from tm “none, nothingness, without, not, naught” (EHD I, 98 & II, 835), and CA laṭīmu is actually from \*latīmu, becoming laṭīmu because the sequence \*ltm is impermissible in the language<sup>100</sup>.

**2.6.13** In what follows, our focus will be below on the relatively large number of initial radicals that are prefixed to [-ṣ], on the interchange of /y/ and /ḡ/, and on a new proot \*ḍaW- “confinement, narrowness”.

CA yaṣṣaṣa, said of a puppy, “to open the eyes”; n. ta-yṣṣīṣu. LA [r. yṣṣ] considers /yaṣṣaṣa/ a variant of /ḡaṣṣaṣa/ and /baṣṣaṣa/ «because the Arabs change /ḡ/ to /y/ and say *ṣīyra-tu* for *ṣaḡara-tu*, *ḡaḥyāḥ* for *ḡaḥḡāḥ*». LA’s statement is half-correct because the Arabs also change /y/ to /ḡ/. The latter change is the only common one in present day Arabic, esp. in *final position*, as, for example, *ḡauharḡiy* from ḡauhariyy “jeweller”; *labbānḡiy* “one who sell laban or yogurt” from *labbāniyy*; etc. This type of change was a basic characteristic feature of some old Arabic dialects, esp. Ḳudā’ah, which regularly

<sup>99</sup> CA [ytm] also signifies “unique, alone” as in ’ad-durra-tu ’al yatīma-tu, developing into “orphan”, according to Abu Ali Ḳālī (Amāli II, 189), also see LA, r. [ytm]. It may be important to note that one of the basic meanings denoted by CA [ytm] is “loneliness”.

<sup>100</sup> HS [tam II] also signifies “to complete, to perfect” also “to bring to an end, finish” as in Ug. tm “to complete” (UG, 531), Phoen., Pun. tmm id (NWSI II, 1221), BHeb. tāmam, CA tamma, CIV ’atamma id. (OT, 1108f), etc., Egyp. tm “to complete, perfect, finish, bring to an end” (EG, 600; EHD II, 833f). In both Egyp. and CA the verb also denotes “to die, perish” as in Egyp. tm, tmm id., CA tmm is seen in Poet. «...fī baṭnihi yāṣīyatun tu-tammima-hu», where tu-tammima-hu lit. “it (= tu-) killed (= cause to be dead, perished) him (= -hu)” (LA).

changed final /-yy/ to /-ġġ/ as in tamīmiyy > tamīmiġġ (Siyyūti's Al Muzhir I, 222). LA (r. 'ng) reports that Abu Jahl said: «'a'lu 'anġi» and he meant «'a'lu 'annī» changing -ī- (from an underlying /y/) into /-ġ-/ . Consider the following line of Poet.:

ġattā 'idā mā 'amsaġa-t wa 'amsaġā (LA).

The first verb 'amsaġa-t “she entered upon the time of evening” is from CIV 'amsa-t [r. msy], by changing an underlying \*-y- into /-ġ-/ . It is important to note here that the *weak radical*, whether it is /y/ or /w/, does not appear on the surface in the 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. fem. perfect. In other words, it is a ‘zero’, and this phenomenon has already been explained (§2.1.7, n. 2 above). The verb is therefore from \*'amsayat. As for the second verb, it is from 'amsā, where /-ā/ is lengthened to compensate for the loss of \*/-y-/, and the original form is 'amsaya. Abu Ali Al-Ḳali says:

*«What Baṣra School (of grammar) prescribes is yaṣṣa, because /y/ can be replaced by /ġ/ since it shares in common with it a similar point of articulation».*

As for the origin of baṣṣa, he adds:

*«It is likely that baṣṣa is from baṣīṣu “glittering, sparkling because when one opens his eyes, he does that, i.e. his eyes glitter»*  
(in LA, r. bṣṣ).

The interchange of /-y/ and /-ġ/ may take place in the root radicals as in 'azġamu [zġm] ~ 'asġamu [sġm] and 'azyamu [z'm] “a camel that does not foam, does not grumble or growl” (LA).

One of the oldest examples of this interchange which has never been discovered before is [rġ'] ~ [ry'] “return, come back”, the former is most widely used form to express “return, come back”, while the latter is arch., surviving in rī'u “the money that comes from any investment; revenue”.

1) CA baṣṣaṣa, also baṣbaṣa with reduplication, “to look by stealth or peep, open the eyes, look”, said of trees “to shoot up or put forth leaves and buds”, said of plants and grass “just begin to appear” also “to flourish (earth)”; baṣbāṣa-tu “eye”; baṣṣa “to glitter, sparkle” also “shine”, etc., connected by Cohen (DRS II, 77) with Ge. bez “brilliant star”, Soq. bṣṣ “become white”, Meh. bēzem “light”. The Eth. and SA words are from \*ba-ḏ- as in CA baḏḏu “extremely white” also “pleasing to the eye, beautiful countenances”. To this root belong Heb būṣ “byssus”, also “cloth of byssus”, so called from its whiteness, BAram. 'bṣ “stannum, tin” (OT, 119), Akk. būṣ-, Phoen. bṣ, Pun. bwṣ “byssus”, Min. bwṣ id., Ge. bisos id. (NWSI I, 185, DRS II, 52), CA bāḏa “be white” (rarely used); 'abyaḏu “white”, hence baida-tu “egg”, BHeb. bēṣī-m, pl., “egg”, Te, bāyyāṣā “be brilliant” (DRS I, 63), Akk. pīṣu “white” (Rabin, 1975: 89).

2) We now return to CA yaṣṣaṣa with its variants ġaṣṣaṣa, etc., this is from \*ṣa'- as in ṣa'ṣa'a, said of a puppy of few days old and thus his eyes are still shut, lit. “(try) to open the eyes before the proper time” also “want to see before being able to open the eyes” (LA, r. ṣ'ṣ'). Here belong BHeb. ṣūṣ “to glance forth, look by stealth” also “to glitter, sparkle”, Talm. heṣīṣ “to glance from the lattice” (OT, 888), Mand. ṣūṣ, ṣīṣ “to peep, shine, appear” (MD, 390). Gesenius (ibid.) connects BHeb. ṣūṣ with CA [wṣṣ] as in waṣwaṣa, with reduplication, “to look by stealth, a female through a hole in her veil”; n. waṣwāṣu (Al 'Ayn VII, 177). Cohen derives [wṣ(w)ṣ] from \*ṣwṣ (DRS VII, 591). In

contrast, Leslau (ibid.) derives {šūš} from two different Semitic roots: (a) šūš “to peep” = CA [wšš] id. and (b) šūš “to shine” = CA dā’a id. Unfortunately, both Cohen and Leslau do not bother to give an explanation of their views. So, we have no way of knowing the type of evidence on which each relies. The following observations should, however, be noted:

2a) Cohen’s view is rejected on the basis that there is no triliteral \*šwš having to do with such notions as “peep, shine”, and the like. The triliteral whether it is [šwš] or [dwd] has to do with “noise”.

2b) Leslau’s view that BHeb.-Aram. šūš “peep” = CA [wšš] fails to account for both the long /ū/ in šūš and for the presence of initial /w-/ in the CA word and its absence from its supposed Heb.-Aram. cognates. Therefore the view is also rejected.

3) The initial /w-/ in CA [wšš] appears to be identical in function and meaning with the initial /w-/ in CA wabaša “to glitter, sparkle, bring into view” also “to peep”, etc. like [bšš] above.

4) It should be stressed here that proot /r-/ like /b-, y-, w-, etc./, can also be prefixed to \*-šš to express “to look by stealth”, hence ta-wšīš = ta-ršīš “looking by stealth” (see LA), and so does /l-/ (ML V, 221).

5) Another proot /h-/ can be added and the resulting triliteral expresses “to glitter (of the eyes)” as in hašša. The glottal stop of \*š’š’ was lost in BHeb. and Aram. \*šu’š-/ši’š-, causing the lengthening of the preceding /u/<sup>101</sup>.

6) Leslau’s view that BHeb. šūš “shine” = CA dā’a cries for explanation. It should be noted, however, that many Semitic roots containing /š/ are from roots with original /ḏ/ or /d/, a subject I will come back to in §2.12.1, n. 4a and illustrate with sufficient examples. Thus CA yašša = yaḏḏa = bašša = baḏḏa = rš = wš, etc. see below. This and other similar phenomena should be kept in mind in the analysis of Semitic roots.

7) By suffixing /-r/ to /bašša/, we get *bašaru* “eyesight, the faculty of seeing”, i.e. *the one it actually does the seeing*; *bašīru* “one who is endowed with the power of discerning or seeing (even things obscure or concealed)” (41:40); *bašīra-tu* “clear-eyed, mind’s eye” (Koran 12: 108); *’abšara* “to see” (Koran 6:104); *bašara*, like [bšš], [yšš], etc. above, said of a puppy, “to open the eyes”; *mu-bšir-* “shining; manifest” Koran (10:67, 27: 86, 40: 61), etc. Cohen (ibid) cites as cognates Ug. bšr “testeur pour pierres”, BHeb. *mebbašēr* “testeur pour l’or” (BHeb. bešer “gold, silver”). Ug.-BHeb. words have nothing to do with CA [bšr].

8) To return to *ša’ša’a*, the quadriliteral [š’š’], like many of its type in the language, owes its origin to reduplication (see §2.7.5 below). I believe that the word, like so many others with a radical /š/, is derived from an original proot with /ḏ/. Abu Amr states that «*yaḏḏa ~ yašša ~ baḏḏa ~ ḡašša are all speech (dialectal) variants expressing the same meaning*» (LA, r. yḏḏ).

<sup>101</sup> Besides all such prefixes, /n-/ can also be prefixed to the root to produce in BHeb. a triliteral [nšš] = šwš “to glitter, sparkle” also “to flower, flourish, blossom” (OT, 690) = CA *naddu*, which is (perh. *one of the earliest known*) term for “coin” (MA, 394; LA) with *nāḏḏ-an* “wealth”. A coin, as we know, was made of “gold” or “silver”. According to Ibin A’rābi, *nāḏḏu* also denotes “manifest” (LA). To /naḏ-/ , CA added the suffix /-r/ and the result a new triliteral [nḏr] “gold, silver” and also as in *naḏura* “to bloom, flourish, shine”, said of trees, “be verdant”, said of color, “be florid, glowing, vivid”.

9) Are both \*baḏīru and its antonym *ḏarīru* “blind” from the same proot. Fortunately, the word *ḏarīru*, pronounced in SL *ḏarēr* is in use and perceived to be based on \*ḏaW-. It may be well here to give a deep account of this new proot since it underlies large numbers of HS trilaterals.

10) The word *ḏarīru*, just cited above, is traditionally classified as derived from the trilateral [ḏr] “adversity, affliction, loss, extreme restraint or confinement, hurt, harm, & the like”. The trilateral is from a proot \*ḏW- {plus -r} and has, as one should expect, three variant trilaterals: CA [ḏwr] as in *ḏāra*, [ḏyr], as in *ḏāra*, [ḏr] (by regressive assimilation) as in *ḏarra* “to hurt, harm, afflict” = Eyp. ḏr-t (from \*ḏ’r-t) “oppression, restraint” (EHD II, 909), ḏ’r “something unpleasant, hateful” (CA *ḏairu*, *ḏawru*) also “enemy” (EHD II, 899) = Akk. *ṣarru* “enemy”, Eth. *ḏar* (Gray 1971: 16), BHeb. [ṣwr] in *ṣūr* “be hostile, persecute”; *ṣar* “enemy” (OT, 906f).

Other Eyp. derivatives are ḏ’ī “wrong, evil; pain, discomfort”; ḏ’ “shame, blemish, dishonor; impurity”; ḏ’ḏ’ “enemy” (HSED, n. 583); ḏ’-t “humiliation, shame; enemy, fiend, foe” (EHD II, 895) = CA [ḏ’d] in *ḏa’ada* “be antagonistic or opponent to”. The word also expresses “catch cold”, and with another suffixed proot [-k], creating a trilateral [ḏ’k], which derives into one word *ma-ḏ’ūku* “catching cold”. The most widely used root for “catching cold” throughout the history of the language is [zkm], which is also used as adj. *ma-zkūm* and as n. *zūkām*.

It is important to think deeply about both the phonological changes which have taken place in [ḏ’k] to become [zkm], and the historical stages required for the changes to occur. Available evidence suggests that [z’k] > [zwk] as in *zāka* “walk in short (and feeble) steps, as a chicken or crow does (from ‘narrowness; constraint’: see below) > [zkk] as in *zakka*, by complete assimilation, id.; *zakku* “emaciated”. For suffixed [k], see §2.1.6.8 above.

By shifting the order of radicals [z’k] to [’zk]: CA *’azku* expresses, like *ḏīku* above, “discomfort, narrowness, strained condition (esp. in wars); *ma-’ziḏu* “narrow place” (*ma-* = place); “strained condition of life” = *ma-ḏīku* “narrow passage”; etc. Another trilateral is [’zl] whose derivatives *’azlu*, *ma’zalu*; etc. express meanings identical with those of [’zk], *ma-’zama* [’zm] = *ma’zalu* “narrow place”, etc. (LA). Most trilaterals and quadrilaterals beginning with /ḏ’-/ seem to be from \*ḏW- as in *ḏa’ā* “emaciate”, [ḏ’l] “diminish, grow less, dwindle”, [ḏ’k] “flu”, [ḏ’d] id., etc.

11) Examination of kindred trilaterals beginning with [ḏW-] strengthens our view that PHS had indeed a proot \*ḏW- signifying “confinement, loss”, etc above. Consider the following trilaterals:

11a) CA [ḏyḏ] “to constrain, confine, trouble, weary, narrow, make tight, etc.”, BHeb. *ṣwḏ* “be narrow, strained, compressed; to distress”, in Eth. “to straiten, to compress; narrow” (OT, 888),

11b) CA [ḏym] ~ [ḏwm] “to treat unjustly, to wrong, oppress; grievance”; ḏy’ (a variant *ṣy’* exists) “to lose, be deprived of, to perish”,

11c) CA [ḏyz] “unjust, oppression, wrong” with three variant pronunciations *ḏīzā* (Koran, 53: 22), *ḏī’zā*, *ḏu’za*.

Returning to trilateral [ḏyḏ], its stem is also seen with infixed \*-n-: BHeb. *ṣnḏ* obsol. perh. “be narrow, straitened”, hence *ṣnḏ* “prison or better stocks, as confining the hands

*and feet*", Sammar ṣṇḵ "to shut up" (OT, 892, 899), CA ḏanaku = ḏīḵu = ḏikku "straits; affliction". The reason for changing \*/ḵ/ to \*/k/ is obvious. It is impossible to pronounce \*ḏanaḵu or \*ḏiḵḵu. Here belong Har. ḥinḵi "misery, trouble, difficulty, anxiety, distress", Tna. 'a-ḥännāḵä "to oppress", E., M., Ms. aḥḥännāḵä(m), Amh. as-ḥännāḵä, Arg. as-ḥennāḵä, etc. (HED, 51).

SL [ḏnk] in ḏanak "hardship, straits" is used only as a n. or adj. just as in the Koran: معيشة ضنكا, *a straitened life* (20:104). To my understanding, it is derived from ḏanā "pinning, straits, emaciation" also "children, sons and daughters" = CA ḏanwu ~ ḏinwu ~ ḏan'u "child, offspring" (ṣinwu "brother, sister", i.e. *from the same mother and father like two palm trees growing up from the same root*) ~ ḏi'ḏi'u "progeny, lot of children", a variant form with /š/ exists. Terms for "child, offspring, etc." are ultimately from [ḏi'] "lineage, stock, genealogy".

There are of course many other trilaterals based on \*ḏW- like CA [ḏ] in 'aḏḏu "hardship"; 'aḏḏa "exert + sadden, strain", [mḏḏ] in maḏaḏu "affliction, pain", maḏḏa "hurt, make painful", etc.

**2.6.14** CA yābisu "dry (of anything, esp. trees, branches, etc.)", yābisa-tu "land, dry land" as opposed to "sea", Eth. yebūs, BHeb. yābēš, Palm., JAram., Syr ybš "dry" (NWSI I, 433), Sab. ybs "arid area" also "to dry up (well, land)" (SD, 166). It is unlikely that the trilateral is from a stem \*baš- as in CA bassu "dust"; bassa, said of the mountains, as in the Koran: (إذا بست الجبال بسا), *render to dust* (56: 5); basbasu "a kind of desert", Egyp. bš "dust" (EHD I, 223).

**2.6.15** Assy. išaru "right, righteous"; ešēru "be straight"; šutēšuru "to direct, lead" (King, 1898: 332), BHeb. yāšār "even, level, right, plain, straight"; yāšar "be even, level, straight, right" (OT, 436-437), CA CII yassara "make easy"; yasra-tu "the straight line of the palm of the hand that crosses other lines" pl. 'asārīru; yasru "easy to drive, lead, or direct", Cush.: Oromo sirri "straight", Sid. sēra id. (HSED, n. 2582): CA surru, sirru, sarru "*line on palm of the hand, front of the head, and face*" as in PIP of A'sha:

«fa ('a)ṇḏur 'ilā kaffin wa 'asrārihā».

PIP Antarah used the plur form 'asrār to refer to any line as in

«bi zuḡāḡatin ṣafrā'a ḏāta 'asirratin».

For stem \*sur and many other derived trilaterals, see §3.10.8 below and §2.3.12, esp. n. b & n. e above.

**2.6.16** Akk. imnu "right hand", Aram. yammīnā, Eth. yamān id. (Gray, 1971: 15), Ug. ymn "right hand" (UG, 535), Palm. ymyn "the right"; ymny "right hand, southern", tymn "southern" (NWSI I, 460f, II. 1212), BHeb. ymn "right hand, the right, south" as well as the hand lifted up in swearing (OT, 402), CA yamīnu "right hand, the right, south" as well as "oath" and the hand lifted up in swearing", Sab. ymn "right hand" also "south" (SD, 168), Egyp. ymn "the right side" also "the West" ~ imnt "west" (EG, 533).

a) In Semitic the '*right hand*' and '*right*' are a *good omen*, hence the trilateral [ymn] also signifies "good fortune, prosperity, happiness, etc." as in BHeb. and CA ymn id. (OT, 403). In contrast, '*the left hand*' and '*left*' are a *bad omen*. For Semitic word for



“left hand, north”, see §2.17.27 below.

#### Comments

It seems to me that /y-/ here is linguistically identical with /y-/ of *yadu* as in Akk. *idu* “side” also “arm, power”, ESA *yd* (MD, 341), Assy. *idu* “hand, side” also “might, strength; possession, price for hire” (King, 1898: 333), Phoen., Pun. *yd* “hand”, BHeb., OAram., OffAram., Palm., JAram., Nab. *yd id.*, Sab. *yd* “hand” also “fealty, loyalty” (Beeston, SD, 167), Ug. *yd*, Eth. Ug. *yd*, Eth. *ēd id.* (Rabin, 1975: 88), CA *yadu* “hand” also “might, strength” as in the Koran: (والسماء بنيناها بأيدي وإن لموسعون), *And the sky, We did raise it up with might, and verily We will (be the expander of it ~) keep on expanding it* (51: 47), and in the proverb «*lā yaday liwāḥidin bi'ašratin*» (Nisabūri, Amthāl I, n. 3524). It also denotes, like that of Sab. “fealty, loyalty” and, like that of Assyrian, “possession, price”, and like that of Akk. “side” as in 'iyyādu “strengthening the side of” also “the left and right sides (of the army)”: 'āyada “to strengthen”; 'aidu “might, strength” (Koran, 38: 45).

Some old Arab scholars derive *yadu* from a biliteral [yd] and some others from a trilateral [ydw] or [ydy], but all agree that the word is derived from “giving, granting, bestowing upon”, and it sometimes occurs as 'ad-, i.e. with /'/ instead of /y/, as in 'adi-hi “his hand” instead of *yadi-hi* (LA, r. ydy), Cush.: Som. *yed* “to give to”, Ari *yed* “to seize”, Egyp. *yd* “hand” (RPAA, n. 993) also “to grasp, seize, give”.

Both [ymn] and [yad] are compounds, the former consists of \*ya- “that which” plus a stem [man] “giving” (see §2.17.72 below) and the latter of the same ya- plus a proot \*d- “giving” (see §2.11.6).

## 2.7 PHS PREFIXED /t-/

The prefix /t-/ serves to form nouns from different classes of verb stems as in CA *tawāfuḵu* “congruence” (*wāfaḵa* “to agree”), *tuk’a-tu* “walking stick” (*waka’a* “to lean on”), *taḥiyya-tu* “greeting” (*ḥayyā* “to greet”), Akk. *tamḥaru* “battle” (*maḥāru* “to fight”), *tānīhu* “sighing” (*anāhu* “to sigh”), *tabrītu* “sight” (*bāru* “to see”), Ug. *tbrr* “freeing” (*brr* “be free”), tsm “beauty” (CA wsm “handsome”), trby(t) “interest (on money)” (CA *ribā* id.), Sab. *tgdm-m* “leprous condition” (CA *taḡaḏḏumu-n*), t’mm “publicity” (CA *ta’mīmu*), Pun. t’šmt “greatness” (‘šm “great, mighty” = CA ‘ḏm id.). It is also used to derive verbs from verbs, nouns from other nouns as in CA *ta-šḡīru* “planting trees” (*šaḡara-tu* “a tree”), and verbs from nouns as in MSA and CA *sauwaḡa* “to market”; *tasauwaḡa* “to do shopping” (*sūḡu* “marketplace, shopping center”).

1) It seems that the prefix was also used to form different type of nouns, esp. in Akk. as the following examples may suggest:

a) Akk. *tanaṣṣaru* “watchman, custodian” (AG, 107): cf. BHeb. *nāṣar* “to watch, guard, keep” (OT, 690), CA *naḏara* “to see, guard, esp. a vineyard” also “to watch, look on” (Koran 2: 50); *nāḏiru* “watchman, guardian”;

b) Akk. *tamkaru* “merchant” (AG, 107): Ug., BHeb. mkr, etc. “to sell” (see §2.10.4 below).

2) Similar examples from CA illustrating agentive \*t- are: as in *tudru’u* “leader (of the tribe)” (Jamharah III, 1246), orig. “attacker, darer” from *dara’a* “to attack”, *tir’idu* “one who startles or trembles out of fear, coward” (CVIII ‘irta’ada “to shake, tremble”)<sup>102</sup>. One may note that the vowel of the prefix is in harmony with the vowel of the 2<sup>nd</sup> syllable. This phonological process of sound change, called *vowel harmony*, is optional and acceptable in CA. Ibin Jinni sees that *tarḡumānu* “translator” (= Akk. *targumānu* id.) could also be pronounced *turḡumānu* because the next syllable contains /-u-/. For the origin of this ancient agent noun, see §2.7.10 below. Sibawayhi (Kitab II, 327) cited *yusrū’u* as an acceptable variant<sup>103</sup> of *yasrū’u*.

The very same prefix /ti-/ is found in CA as in *timsāḥu* “liar” (not to be confused with *timsāḥu* “crocodile” = Egyp. msh id., in Assyr. *namsuḥa*: cf. EHD I, 325), *tiklāmu* “one who is talkative” (klm “to speak, talk”), *til’ābu* “one who plays a lot” (l’b “to play”). It is also used in place-names as in *ti’šāru* and *tibrāku*.

3) Although the affix /t/, whether a prefix or infix, may appear in some cases below as *active in force* in one or more languages as in Akk.-Assyr. *tabāku* “to shed, pour out”

<sup>102</sup> To my understanding, the actual meaning of proot [ti] is *a particular type of object of verb or of any word it is prefixed to*; it is the opposite of ‘agent’. Comp. CA *tilmīḏ* “pupil, student”: gen. Sem. lmd “to learn” (§2.7.29 below). In some cases, this particular [ti] seems to express a sort of ‘belonging to’.

<sup>103</sup> Another type of vowel harmony is noted in some Old Arabic dialects in stem {Fa’īL(u)}, where the vowel /-a-/ of the first syllable changes to /-i-/ to agree with the vowel /-ī-/ of the next syllable in the features *front* and *high* as in *ba’īr* > *bi’īr* “beast of burden”, *šahīd* > *šihīd* “martyr”, *kaṭīr* > *kiṭīr* “much, abundant”, etc. (Al ‘Ayn VII, 174). In most modern dialects, the verb stem [Fa’īLa] is subject to vowel harmony as in CA *fahima* “understand” > *fihim*; ‘arifa “know” > ‘irif, etc.

(see §2.7.6 below), it is most scientific, even in such cases, to derive it from PHS reflexive /t/: comp. the Akk.-Assyr. form with its CA cognate *ta-bāka* “to pretend shedding tears, *make oneself cry*”. In the overwhelming majority of cases, however, this early function of /t/ has been faithfully preserved, esp. in CA.

For phonotactic considerations, the prefix \*t- may become emphatic or voiced. Some examples of /t/ > /ṭ/ are: CA *ṭaymaša*-tu “weak-sightedness”: *ṣamšu* id., *ṭuymūsu* “Satan, evil person” (this is like *tudru’u*, etc. above): *ṣamūsu* in a fixed expression “sinful, flagrant lie under oath” (both from PHS stem [ṣam] “cover, conceal”: cf. §2.2.1 above), *ṭara’a* “to appear or come into view suddenly, emerge suddenly”: *ra’ā* “to see” (for other prefixes added to *ra’ā*, see §§2.4.34 above and 2.10.11 below, etc.).

4) In Hamitic languages the t- serves to form passive and reflexive stems as in Berber: Shil. *aš* “to eat” > *tšša* “be eaten”. In Cushitic the same /t-/ is used as a suffix as in Bil. *gadd* “be rich” > *gadd-t* “become rich”, Bed. *kami* “be sad” > *kami-t* “make oneself sad” (Barton, 1934: 23, n. 7).

As to the ultimate origin of this suffix, it is, I believe, one of the Semitic proots for “self” as in CA \*-tu “self”, seen in *ḏātu-hu* “itself, himself”, fem. *ḏātuḥā*. The word is a compound of *ḏā* masc. “this” (§2.20.3 below) and \*-t “self”, perh. a simple demonstrative in origin: cf. CA *tā* fem. “this” = Egyp. *t* “this” (EHD II, 815).

In Egyp., too, prefixed /-t/ became part of the root. An obvious example is *t’l’l* “to rejoice” (EHD II, 820) = CA *tala’la’a* id.; *tala’lu’u* “complete joy, rejoice, glittering”, whose initial *ta-* forms CV stems (see §2.1.7.3 above), Har. *alall*, etc. gen. Eth. languages “shout of joy” (HED, 25).

**2.7.1** CA *’ittaḡaha*, wrongly classified in LA as being from root [tḡh], “to head to, direct the face to” = CVIII (\**’iwtaḡaha* >) *’ittaḡaha* of *waḡaha*, *waḡḡaha* “to direct the face to”: *waḡhu* “face”. Some identical examples are CA *tahiḏa*, *’ittahaḏa* “to take, adopt” = \**’i’tahaḏa* > *’ittahaḏa*, CVIII of *’ahaḏa* “to take, adopt”; *taka’a* “to lean on” from \**’iwtaka’a* > *’ittaka’a*, CVIII of *waka’a* “to lean on”, etc. (see Sibawayhi’s *Kitab* II, 356f). These examples and many others provide a notable example of regressive assimilation where the initial root consonant, whether it is /w/, /y/, or /ʾ/, changes its point and manner of articulation to match that of the infix/-t/, which forms CVIII of verbs. This is a living process in Arabic and we should expect it in any CVIII verb form. e.g. *waḡada* “to burn” > CVIII \**’iwtaḡada* > *’ittaḡada* “be burned up”. The assimilatory process admits no exceptions and can therefore be stated in terms of the following phonological rule:

*waXaZa* + -t- > CVIII \**’iwtaXaZa* > *’ittaXaZa*  
*waṣala* “to connect” > \**’iwtaṣala* > *’ittaṣala* “be connected”.

The rule also explains the loss of initial -w- as prefixes are added to stems to form derivatives in CA as well as in all other Semitic languages, e.g. CA *wazana* “to weigh” > inst. *mīzānu* (\**miwzānu*) “balance”, etc. (Sibawayhi’s *Kitab* II, 357f), Ug. mzn-m, pl., from \**mwzn*-m id. (UG, 530), tsm “beauty” ~ ysmt id. (UG, 530) = CA *wasāma*-tu id., Sab. *tfry* [r. wfr] “to cultivate”; mfr “cultivated land” (SD, 158), BHeb. *ykr* “be rare, precious, heavy” > *hōḳīr*, caus., (\**hoyḳīr*) “make rare” (DRS VII, 610) = CA *wkr*.

**2.7.2** Sab. tld “birth”; ’tld “original, inherited property” also “serf born in the household” (SD, 147-148), CA tilādu “birthplace”; talīdu “one who is born in the house” also “inherited property” as in the PIP of Ṭarfah:

«...wa bay’ī wa ’infākī ṭarīfī wa *mutladī*» (JAA, p. 324, line 59).

All are from the root in Sab. wld “to bear or beget child, be born”, Ug. yld “to give birth” (UG, 531), CA walada “to give birth”; wilāda-tu “birth”; mīlādu “birth-date”: PHS stem \*wal- (see §3.1.14.2 above). The prefix \*t- in CA-Sab. words is different from the known Sem. /t-/. It is most likely a proot signifying “familial, belonging to the family” (see §2.7.24 below).

**2.7.3** Sab. tlw “to continue to do something” (SD, 148), CA talā “to follow”; tatāla “to come in succession”; tatāliyā “continuously”: from \*wl-: cf. CA wāla (fī’la ’aš-šai’i) “to continue (to do something); ta-wāla “to follow in succession”; ’awlā, walla “to appoint, or make, ruler” = Sab. yt-lw-n “to assign” (CD, 148): PHS stem \*wal-. Some derivatives of this stem are: Palm. yly “near to” (NWSI I, 458) = CA yaliya “near to” as in ‘His house waliy mine’ (LA), Ugr yly “companion” = CA waliy id., Min. wly ~ tly “être chargé de” = CA ta-wallā id., Eth.: Amh. wālo alā “s’écarter” = CA wallā “to turn away from” (Koran 3: 20) also “to change (direction, etc.)” = Berb. To. wal “tourner, changer de direction”, SA: Jib. ōlī “se tourner vers, guider vers” (DRS VII, 549) = CA wallā “to direct to, turn to” (Koran 2: 115, 2: 144), etc.

a) The same proot is seen with suffixed \*t- as in Ge. wallaṭa “changer, transformer”, Te. ’awallāṭā “se détourner, se retirer, dévier”, Amh. wāllāṭa “changer, se déguiser” (DRS VII, 550-551). This same troublesome /-t/ is seen in §2.2.47, n. 7d above.

**2.7.4** CA tušḥa-tu “anger” is, according to Azhari (see LA, r. tšḥ), *is from ’ušḥa-tu; the hamzah (i.e. /’/) changed to /w/ (becoming \*wušḥah), then /w/ became /t/ (tušḥah), just as the speakers of the language changed /w/ to /t/ in turāḥu (= inheritance, r. wrḥ) and taḥwā (= fearing God, r. wḥy): šaḥṣaḥu, said of a man, “with a bad temper”, šaḥḥa “be greedy, covetous”, BHeb. šaḥ “depressed, cast down” (OT, 1044).*

**2.7.5** There are many HS roots owing their origins to reduplication. It may be well to begin with a definition of the term ‘*reduplication*’ accompanied with some illustrative examples. *The term is defined here as a sequence of two separate words, the second is identical with the first as in English goody goody.* Some examples are:

1) CA ’ih ’ih, said of animals and used in the imperative, “kneel down!”, hence nahha [nh] “make kneel down (usu. an animal)” ~ nāha [r. nwh] “to kneel down (understood as) by itself (usu. an animal)”; CIV ’anāha “make one kneel down”; nauha-tu “dwelling”.

2) CA [r’r’] “move the eye exceedingly while looking at something”: CIV ’ar’ā id.: ra’ā “to see”, gen. HS id. (§2.10.11).

3) CA [nhnh] in nahnaha “to prohibit; prohibition”: nahā id. ~ = na’na’- (Al ’Ayn VIII, 395) = BHeb. nwh, etc. “say no” (OT, 655).

4) CA [b’b’] in ba’ba’a “say Ba(ba)”: ’abu “father”.

5) CA taytaya and tayā [r. tyy] “noise or sound of laughing” are both from tiy tiy id.

The verb also expresses “to stammer, stutter” (= BHeb. *tʿʿ*: OT, 1113), from a proot \**γW*- (see §2.13.22 below).

6) CA *diġ diġ* “yelling at a hen” > *daġ daġa* “to yell at a hen” also, said only of a hen, “to run”; *daġāġa-tu* “hen”.

7) CA *daʿ daʿ* “rise!, get up! (said of a person who falls down)” > *daʿdaʿa* “to rise, get up”, hence Ruʿbah says:

«waʿin hawā (ʿa)l ʿāθiru ḵulnā *daʿdaʿā* lahu...» (Al ʿAyn I, 81)<sup>104</sup>.

8) A very interesting case of such repeated forms is CA *ʿuf ʿuf*, an expression used when *smelling a bad smell*, hence CV *taʿaffafa* “be discontented with a bad smell”, later developed into “be discontented, annoyed, to grumble” (LA, r. ʿff), hence Koranic (17: 23): (فلا تقل لهم أف) and (67: 21): (أف لكم...). On the other hand, the derivative *ʿuffu* expresses “earwax, filth, dirt under the finger nail” > *tuffu* [r. tff] id., where \**t*- becomes a part of the root. Similarly, *tuffa-tu* = *ʿuffa-tu* “trivial, little; pooh, ugh”, both are also used to express “annoyance”; *taftafa* “to become filthy, dirty” also “to spit out”, with /-n/ becoming part of the root: *tafanu* [r. tfn] “filth, dirt”, with /-h/ becoming part of the root: *tafiha* [r. tfh] “trivial, insipid, tasteless” as in *Hadith*: «*lā yatfahu wa lā yuhliḵu*», with /-l/ becoming part of the root: *tifla-tu* “bad smell, disgusting smell” as in the PIP of Aʿsha:

«...lilaḍḍati (ʿa)l maraʿi, lā ġāfin wa lā *tafilu*» (ŠM, p. 20, L. 9);

*tafila* = *taftafa* in meaning; *tafala* “to spit out” as in Poet.:

«... matā yaḥsu minhu māʾiḥu (ʿa)l ḵaumi ya-*tfuli*» (ML I, 349).

Cognates are Har. *uf bāya* “to blow, blow out”, Tna. *ʿuf bālā* “blow to revive the fire”, Te. *ʿəf bela*, Amh. *əff alā*, etc., Cush.: Kam. *uffaʿe*, Qab. *úffiyo*, Som. *afuf* (HED, 21). Har. *ʿuff* *exclamation of fatigue or of boredom*, Tna. *ʿuf way* id. < CA *ʿuff* id., Chad.: Sura, Angas *fī* “to blow”, Bura *fīa*, Margi *fī*, Gisiga *fe*, Buduma *pha* id. (HSED, n. 797).

Without the above analysis of CA [*ʿuf*], it will be quite impossible to get into the proot underlying the following HS cognates:

9) Aram. *təpap* “to spit”, Mand. *tup* “pooh, ugh”, Ge. *täfʿa* “to spit”, Tna. *täfʿe*, Te., Amh. *täfʿa*, *täffa*, Har. *tuf bāya* “to spit”, Gaf. *täffä*, Ed. *tuf barä*, S., W. *tuf balä*, E., M., Go., A. *täffa-m*, En. *itf barä* “to spit”, Cush.: Ga. *tufa*, Som., Bed. *tuf* “to spit”, Oromo *tufe*, Sid. *tufi*, Bil. *ṭif*, Xamir *tify* id. (HED, 148; MD, 483), Chad.: Housa *tōfa* “to spit”, Ngamo, Bolewa, Fyer *tup*, Mbara *tuf*, Dera *tuvi* “to spit”, Logone *tufi*, Zime *tufo*, Masa *tuf-*, Kera *tufi*, Mubi *tuffa* id. (HSED, n. 2413; Carnochan, 1975: 465). Eyp. *tf*, *tfn* “to spit” (EHD II, 833), We may note here that Cush., Chadic, Eyp., and Semitic have all adopted a PHS affix as part of the root. There are other affixes that have also become permanently attached to the root as the following examples show:

9a) CA *tfl* above, BHeb. *tpl* “to glue” may be from “to glue with spittle” also “anything unseasoned”, *metaph.* “insipid”, JArām., Mand. *tpl* “slime, adhesive” (MD, 480), SA: Meh. *tefōl* “to spit”, Jib., Shh. *tfol* id., Chad.: Muktele *tfala* “to spit”. The triliteral may express in some languages “bottom, low”; this is from [pal] “fall” (§2.2.21 above).

<sup>104</sup> But, *ta-dāʿa* [dʿy], said of a wall, etc., “fall down or apart, collapse”.

9b) BHeb. \*twp, obsol., BAram. twp “to spit out” = CA taffa above (OT, 1099).

9c) Egyp. ntf “to sprinkle, to pour out”, Cush.: Arg. ntf “to spit out” (HED I, 401; HSED, 410).

As one should expect, the order of radicals [ʔp] can be shifted, hence [pʔ] expresses “to blow” as in Chad.: Bura fia, Margi fi, Gisiga fe, Buduma pha id., etc. (HSED, n. 797), BHeb. pāʔā “to blow, breathe” (OT, 831): see §2.2.30 above. *Aren’t all of these roots and numerous others from pū “mouth”.*

**2.7.6** Akk. tabāku “to pour out” (AG, 107), Assy. tabāku “to pour out, shed” (King, 1898: 396) = CA CVI tabāka [of bakā] “to pretend shedding tears”; tabkāʔu “shedding a lot of tears”: bakā “to shed tears, weep”, Assy. bakū “to weep” (King, op.cit: 338): PHS stem \*bak- “to shed tears, weep”.

**2.7.7** BHeb. tāḳaʔ “to strike, smite” (OT, 1116) = Ge. waḳʔa, waḳʔa “to strike, beat”, Te. wāḳʔa “to beat”, Tna. wāḳəʔa “to beat”, Amh. waḳḳa “to beat, knock down”, Arg. wāḳḳa, Gour. wāḳ(ḳ)a “to beat” (DRS VII, 608), CA waḳaʔa “to strike, beat (with mīḳaʔa-tu, from \*miwḳaʔa-tu, “hammer”); CIV ʔawḳaʔ + prep. phrase *bihim* “to kill”; waḳʔa-tu ~ wāḳīʔa-tu “war, fight”; CV tawaḳḳaʔa “to expect, anticipate, guess”, orig. “to throw a guess at X (X = object of guessing, of anticipating”, as in *I guess he is coming* (his coming = X], this is in turn from “to throw a stone (stone = waḳʔu) at somebody located a very short distance away as if you intend to place the thrown object on him or make it fall on him”, hence ta-wḳīʔu “unerring strike or hit”. As a verb, it occurred in the passive in Poet.:

«...tuwaḳḳaʔu dūnahu wa takuffu dūnī».

CV tuwaḳḳa “to strike or hit” (LA, r. wḳʔ).

The BHeb. verb above is most likely from a form similar to CA CVI tawāḳaʔa “to fight, strike”: PHS stem \*ḳaʔ- “to fall, lie down” as in CA waḳaʔa “to fall”; waḳʔa-tu “sleeping at the end of the night”, perh. Chad.: Dera wukot “to fall”, Tangale wuge, uk id., Mofu wak id. (HSED, 526), etc. see §§2.4.7-8 above & 3.12.28 below. As illustrations, CA ʔawḳaʔa above simply expresses “cause to fall”, by adding the prepositional phrase *bihim*, “to kill” = *cause the enemies to fall down* = BHeb. yḳʔ “be dislocated” also *metaph.* “be alienated”; *Hiph.* “to hang up on a stake or cross, to impale” (OT, 420), hence = nḳʔ, with prefixed n-, “be dislocated” also *metaph.* “be alienated” (OT, 693; Hurwitz, 1966: 96).

Other derivatives of BHeb. [tḳʔ] and their CA cognates are:

a) לָהֵל + תָּקַע [consisting of tḳʔ + ʔhl “tent”] “to pitch a tent”, i.e. *by fasting it with pins driven into the earth* = CA wiḳāʔa-tu, said when “the edges of (tent) curtains reaching the ground”. Based on the meaning of the BHeb. form, Gesenius posits a semantic heading “to strike or drive a thing into another”: cf. CA waḳaʔa, said of a knife, sword, etc., “insert it between two stones in order to sharpen it”; wāḳaʔa “to have sexual intercourse”, etc. see §2.12.28 below.

b) In a phrase: Ex. 10, 19, tḳʔ denotes “to cast (into the sea)” = CA CIV ʔawḳaʔ (fi ʔal-yammi) “cast (= *cause to fall*) (into the sea)”.

c) כָּף + תָּקַע (= hand) “to clap the hands” = CA tawḳīʔu has, according to LA, the

same meaning as *taľfıķu*, i.e. *raising the hand(s) upward*, also *waķķ'a* “to sign”, of course, *with the hand*, SA: Jib. *ōķa'* “to sign, mark”.

d) *tēķa'* “clangor of the trumpet” = CA *'iķā'u* “harmony of sounds” also “science of musical sounds”: *waķ'u* “sound (echo) of footsteps”.

**2.7.8** Egyp. *tkw* “flame”, *tki* “to kindle a fire, burn”, Copt. *tōk id.*, Chad.: Housa *tōkā* “ash” (HSED, 2417; EHD II, 845): Akk. *kawū* “to burn”, CA *kawā* “to cauterize, burn, brand with fire”, BHeb. *kāwā* “kindle a fire, burn”, Chad.: Tangale *kawe* “to roast”, Miya *kaw*, Kariya *kaw id.*, Kera *ki* “to set fire, fry, burn”, etc. (HSED, n. 1441).

CA *kawā* is used for two purposes: (a) *a medical treatment* and (b) *an identification of an animal*. Of these two meanings, the latter represents the oldest signification. It is also used nowadays “to iron (clothes)”.

a) Another trilateral based on [kaw] is *kwr* “furnace” as in Phoen. *kr id.* (NWSI I, 534), CA *kūrū* “furnace, forge”, BHeb., Syr. *kwr* “furnace” (OT, 454), etc.

**2.7.9** The meanings expressed by CA [trġ] are: *tariġa* “be inexplicit, ambiguous, vague (speech)”; *taraġa* “to hide”, and *mu-traġu*, said of a dress, “of the color purple”. Before deciding upon the ultimate origin of this root in CA, let us examine the trilateral [rtġ], which has in common with [trġ] the same underlying semantic content.

1) CI *'artaġa* [r. rtg] “be agitated, shaken (sea, etc.)”; *rataġa* “to speak obscurely” also “to speak incoherently, be unable to complete an utterance”; *ratġu*, said of words “being too vague or obscure to be read”; *'urtiġa*, pass., “be incomprehensible, ambiguous, vague (book, words, and the like)”; CIV *'artaġa* “to close, shut”, hence *ritāġu* “door”, Lih., Ge. *rtg id.*

2) It is obvious that [trġ] is from [rtg] by metathesis, this in turn has developed from CVIII *'i-rtaġġa* of [rġ]: *raġġa* “to shake, agitate, confuse”, *raġraġa*, with reduplication, “to vibrate with tremendous motion, quiver”. The passive form occurs in the Koran: (وَإِذَا رَجَّتِ الْأَرْضُ رَجًا), *when the earth shall be shaken with a (tremendous) shaking* (56:4). CVIII *'irtaġġa*, becoming CI of [rtġ] above, “be agitated, shaken (sea, etc.)”, Chad.: Kwan *rake* “to tremble”, Mobu *lage id.* (HSED, n. 2087).

3) The stem *\*rag-* underlies the trilaterals above as well as the following trilaterals:

3a) Phoen. *rgz* “be agitated” (PG, 146), BHeb. *rāgaz* “be moved, disturbed, thrown into commotion, angry; to tremble, to quake”, BAram. *rgz* “be angry” (OT, 961), CA *raġiza*, said of animals, “to tremble, quake (esp. when standing up)”, Syr., Mand. *rgz* “angry; be angry”.

3b) BHeb. *rāga'* trans. “to agitate, make tremble”; intrans. “to be afraid, terrified, to shrink together for fear; hence be still, quiet”, Eth. *rg'* “to contract, be coagulated”, Syr. *rg'* “be contracted, of the skin”. Gesenius (OT, 963) considers CA *ra'aġa* (by metathesis) “to tremble, be disturbed, troubled” as cognate. See, however, §2.1.9.1., n. 2 above.

3c) BHeb., BAram. *rgš* “to run together with tumult” (OT, 963), OffAram. *rgš* “be excited, be furious” (NWSI II, 1061), Aram., Syr., Mand. *rgš* “make an uproar, shake”, CA *rġs* “noise, of thunder”.

3d) CA *rġf* “to quake, shake violently, agitate, quiver, shiver”, JAram., Mand. *rgp* “to

shake, to flicker (of light)” (MD, 425), Har. rāgāfa “fall to the ground (fruit, leave)”, Tna. rāgāfā, Amh. rāggāfā, etc. HED, 133. In addition, CA rġd “to quake, tremble”, CA rġĥn “to tremble”, raġiba “be afraid of, fear”, etc.

As for notion of “be vague, ambiguous, etc. speech”: raġġa-tu “uproar, tumult”, and for “purple” as expressed by mutraġu above: (ʾu)rġuw(ān) “red purple, red dye”, Ug. argmn “purple” (UG, 535), Assy. argamannu, Bab. argauānu, argamannu, BHeb. ʾrgm “(red) purple” (King, 1898: 324; MD, 424). Related roots are discussed in §2.7.10 below and also in §2.15.21 below.

### Comments

There is a certain relationship between /r-/ and /w-/ which is hard to identify. For example, waġafa, like waġaba, = raġafa in n. 3d above. The major difference in meaning here lies in ‘*application*’; waġafa applies to *the heart* “to throb, palpitate”, while raġafa applies to ‘*hands, legs, body*’, but this difference may be a later development. As a guess, it is possible that /w-/ expresses s.t. in some roots like ‘*inner, internal*’ and /r-/ ‘*external*’, but this differentiation can’t be generalized. For additional examples see [rzn], [wzn] in §2.5.9 above & §2.15 below.

**2.7.10** CA tarġama [r. trġm] “to translate, interpret”; tarġumānu “interpreter” (= Akk. targumānu id.) from raġama “to talk about something without sufficient information, guess, conjecture, curse”. In the Koran it means “to guess” as in: (رجما بالغيب), *guessing about the unknown* (18: 22), Ug. rgm “to speak; word; message” (UG, 534, 536, 537), Akk. ragāmu “to shout, howl, accuse”, Eth. ragama “to curse” (Rabin, 1975: 88, n. 72).

a) The root also expresses “to stone” as in CA raġama, Hatra. rgm id. (NWSI II, 1060), Aram., Mand., Syr., Eth. rgm “to stone” (MD, 424), BAram. rgm id., BHeb. margēmā “heap (of stone)” = CA ruġma-tu, marġama-tu “heap of stones” (OT, 962). Semitic [rgm] “stone” is related to CA raġmu “grave”; riġāmu “large stones placed on the grave”; raġama “to weep or lament a dead person” = Assy. rigim “cry, lamentation” (King, 1898: 384). For other kindred trilaterals, see §2.15.21 below.

b) We cannot close this section without accounting for Semitic \*rag- “be wicked, evil, bad (man)” as in Assy. ragāgu “be wicked”; raggu “wicked”; targigu “sinner, wicked man” (King *ibid.*) = CA riġriġa-tu “evil people, insane people, wicked people, riff-raff”. This root is related to \*rag- ‘shout’ etc. above, but seems unrelated to PHS stem \*rag- ‘man’, seen in Cush.: Som. reg, pl., “man”, Ga. raga “prophet”. In CA the root is preserved, at least, in two trilaterals: raġmu, sg. or pl., “friend(s), companion(s)”, prob. final -mu is orig. a pl. suffix. The other word is raġulu “man”, adj. “might and perfection”; rugūla-tu “strength”; ʾirtiġālu “speaking off hand, extemporaneous talk or speech”, BHeb. rgl “to go about tattling and tale bearing, backbite” (OT, 961). Consider SL CVIII ʾirtažal “to speak extemporaneously”, from [rġl], and CX ʾistarža “to dare”, from a root [raž] lying beneath the trilateral [rgl]. There is another CX with -l: ʾistaržal expressing “behave or act like a man”<sup>105</sup>.

<sup>105</sup> I have noted that the rare loss of final radical in SL is never associated with a difference in meaning: cf. ʾaḥsa min or ʾaḥsan min “better than” from CA ʾaḥsana min id.: ḥasanu “fair, good, beautiful”; ḥassana “to adorn, beautify”, BHeb. ḥšn “ornament” (OT, 354).



Examination of other significations denoted by CA [rġl] reveals that raġulu is not just a ‘man’, any ‘man’, but, in fact, “a chief, master or lord”. LA states that *riġlu* is used to date important events occurring in *the period, life, and rule of a leader*: «*kān ḏālīka ‘alā riġli fulān, ‘ay fī ḥayātihi wa zamānihi wa ‘ahdihi*» = *that was in the lifetime of somebody, that is to say in ‘his life’, ‘his time’, and ‘his reign’*.

The word also expresses “front (i.e. *before all*)”, preserved in the fixed expression «*lī ‘ar* (i.e. ‘al “the”) *riġlu*» (LA). Evidence from other Semitic languages confirms our view: ESA rgl “period of office” (1962: 30), Aram. sargēl, with prefixed caus. \*s- < \*š- “to rule” (Hurwitz, 1966: 43), Palm. rgl “man” also “time” (NWSI II, 1060), Tham. rgl “man” (Branden, 1950: 518). The trilateral will be re-examined in §2.17.3 below.

**2.7.11** CA ‘at’ara [r. t’r] “to look fixedly at”; ta’ara “to stare at”. This has developed from caus. \*‘ar’- > ‘arr- > [r. \*‘rr] as in *yata ‘arrā* “he inquires into, he pries into”, which is in turn from ra’ā “to see”; imper. ‘ari! ~ ra! “see!”, Ge. rə’əyā “to see”, Tna. rā’ayā, Te. ra’a, Har. ri’a id. (HED, 132), Lih. r’y “judgment, view” (= CA ra’yu), Šaf. r’y “scene” (= CA ma-r’ā), etc. see below §§2.7.11, 2.7.31, 2.10.11-12, 2.17.2, etc. To the stem [ra’] certainly belongs Pun. tr’h “observation” (NWSI II, 1229).

**2.7.12** CA tafi’ [t’f] “at the time of”, ta’if [t’f] “after, following”. The initial t- is a prefix (LA; ML I16-17): PHS stem [‘ap] “further, also, after, following” as in OArām. ‘p “further, also”, ‘p(m) “still, again” (Rosenthal, AG, 8), OffArām. ‘pm “again, in addition” (NWSI I, 97), Phoen., Pun. ‘p “also, moreover, even” (NWSI I, 92-93), Akk. appūna “furthermore, thus” (AG, 67), BHeb., BAram. ‘ap, Syr. ‘āp “besides, even, also” (OT, 76). Gray, 1971: §292), CA fa “and also” as well as “next in time, space or order”.

The proot is also seen in CA ‘iffānu [‘fn] ~ ‘ibbānu [‘bn] “during, at the time of, at first and at the proper time” = BHeb. ‘pn “time, season” (OT, 79), OffArām. ‘pn “fixed time” (NWSI I, 97). CA final \*-nu is a derivational suffix, according to Ibin Barry (LA, r. ‘fn), since one can also use ‘afafu to express the same meaning. Ahmad Bin Faris (ML I, 16-17) rightly treats the triliterals [t’f], [t’f], and [‘fn] as derivatives of [‘f] as in ‘a ‘alā ta-‘iffa-ti ḏāka wa ‘afafi-hi wa ‘iffā-ni-hi. See §§2.17.13, 2.17.14 below.

#### Comments

To my understanding, [‘f-n or ‘b-n] = “during, then, etc. **only in the past**”, i.e. *is used when we are talking only about a given period of time in the past*, as in ‘ibbān (‘a)l ḥukmi (‘a)l ‘umawī, during the Ommayyad dynasty, ‘ibbān (‘a)l ‘aṣri (‘a)l ḡāhili, during the pre-Islamic times, and so on. It is evident that \*‘af- is a proot for “former, afore” and so is [‘b]. The proot is seen in many triliterals, esp. in CA and Egyp., and some of them will be discussed in depth in §2.17.14 below.

**2.7.13** Akk. tarāṣu “to set up, erect”, Aram., Syr., Man. trṣ “to set up, establish, make straight” (MD, 490), Palm. trṣ “to arrange” also “to settle” (NWSI, II, 1233), CA taraṣa ~ ṭalaṣa ~ dalaṣa, “to make exact, make firm, fix properly”. The t- is from CV taraṣṣa or taraṣṣa of raṣṣa id. (comp. CV tamaddada of madda “stretch”, CV ta‘addada of ‘adda “count”, etc.). For Palm. trṣ “to settle”: cf. CA raṣraṣa id., etc. see §2.5.9 above.

It is to be noted that /š/ and /s/ interchange position (see §3.2.48), hence n. raššu = rassu; adj. maršūšu = marsūsu, etc. (Al ‘Ayn VII, 191). In addition, rasā “be fixed firmly”; rāsiya- “immovable, i.e. *fixed in a place*” (Al ‘Ayn VII, 290) = rasaḥa and rāsiḥa- respectively; they differ only in shades of meaning. Sab. rs’y “to lie heavily on someone” (SD, 118) = CA rasā “be fixed on, to anchor”<sup>106</sup>. Comp. with roots in §2.12.43 below.

**2.7.14** CA tayhūru “between top and bottom of a mountain, a prominent heap of sand”; tauhariy “high hump”: PHS stem [har] “mountain” as in Ug. hr id. (UG, 534), etc.

**2.7.15** CA taḳaḳa *arch.* (a stem difficult to pronounce) “fall from higher to lower place”; tataḳtaḳa *arch.* (almost impossible to pronounce) “to descend from a mountain” also “to fall down from a mountain (ML I, 339) < ḳīḳu “a mountain surrounding the world” = Egypt. ḳ’ḳ’ “a hill in *Khemnu* on which the heavens rested”; ḳ’ “high, high land” (EHD II, 761). The CA derivative reminds me of another strange stem *naḳtaḳa* [r. nḳḳ] = taḳaḳa in meaning. Both stems were probably coined after the 10<sup>th</sup> century.

**2.7.16** CA tā’iru “one who perseveres in his work (esp. after languor)”: CA ‘ar- “do, make, work”, Egypt. ‘r “do, make, fashion, create”, etc. see §2.1.6.7., n. 6c above: PHS proot [’ar].

**2.7.17** Akk. takālu “to trust, confide” (AG, 107), Assy. takālu “to trust in” (King, 1898: 396), OArām. tkl “to rely” (Rosenthal, AG, 15), OffArām. tkl “to trust, entrust, rely” (NWSI, II, 1214). Both Akk. and Arām. adopted the infix -t- that forms CVIII verbs in CA: cf. CA wakala “to entrust with, commit to”; CVIII \*’iwtakala > ’ittakala “to trust in, place confidence in, rely on”: Arām. ’l ttkly ‘l mšlmt (NWSI ibid) = CA lā (or ’alā) tttkl (\*tttwwl > tattakil) ‘alā maslamatu lit. “(Do)not you rely on Maslamatu”. Note that the first /t-/ of Arām. /ttkly/ and CA /tattakil/ is “you (masc. sg.)”, the second is “the reflexive”, but the third of the CA form is from an underlying \*w. This underling \*w became first a subject of complete regressive assimilation in Arām. and Akk., later merged with the preceding /t-/, thus giving rise to a new trilateral /tkl/.

CA wkl above = Sab. wkl “to entrust” (SD, 160), BHeb., Arām. ykl “to trust, entrust”, Ge. tawakkala “to entrust” (= CA CV tawakkala “rely on; entrust”), Tna. tāwākkālā id. Te. wākkālā “to trust”, etc. (DRS VI, 539). For Akk. waklu “mandatory, representative, agent, chief”: cf. CA wakīlu id.

**2.7.18** Akk., OffArām., Hatra. tgr “merchant”, Syr. tagoro id., Palm. tgry, pl., “merchant”; tgr’ “business, trade” (NWSI, II, 1203-1204), CA tāḡiru “merchant”, perh. orig. is “seller of wine” as in the PIP of Labid:

«...ḡawīyyun saḳāhu fī (’a)t tiḡāri nadīmu» (DL, 182, line 2).

PHS stem [gar] > ’gr > \*t’gr > tgr (see §2.10.4 below & §2.3.4 above).

<sup>106</sup> One can add a suffixed proot /-b/ to create a new trilateral [rsb] “to sink (to the bottom) by its own weight, fall to the bottom, settle down”; rusūbāt pl. “sediment”, as a vb rasaba (for proot [b], see §2.13 below).

**2.7.19** CA tabinu "sagacious, intelligent" > tabina "to examine closely (with the eyes), scrutinize" (Al 'Ayn VIII, 129): [byn] "to show, prove; evident" < [by] (see §2.13.24, n. 5c & 3.17.58 below).

**2.7.20** CA [r. twd] as in tūdu, coll., "tree"; taud-iyatu "a piece of wood" is from [wd]. Initial /t-/ is a prefix, according to Azhari (LA). Jawhari (ṢHH II, 549) rightly derives *waddu* from *watidu* and ascribes the change to assim. upon the loss of /-i-/, thus *watidu* > \**watdu* > *waddu*: cf. CA *watidu* "peg, wedge"; *watada* "to fix", BHeb. *yātēd* "peg, pin, nail" (OT, 437), Ge. *wadda* "to insert", Te. *wāt(a)dä*, *wättä* "to fix in the ground" (DRS VII, 650).

1) PHS \*tw-/ \*dw- "tree" is seen in many words for different kinds of trees in Semitic as in CA *tālu* [r. twl] coll. "young palms", Sab. twl id. (SD, 148); CA *tūzu* [r. twz] coll. "a kind of trees"; Egyp. twn "figs, fig-tree", BHeb. *tānā* (EHD II, 825), Pun., OffAram. tyn "fig" (NWSI II, 1212), CA *tīnu* coll. "fig trees" also "fig"; CA *tuffāḥu* coll. "apple trees", Ug. tḥ "an apple" (UG, 530), BHeb. *tappūḥā* "an apple, apple tree", so-called *from the fragrance which it exhales* (OT, 1113). The word is a compound of \*tw- "tree" and a stem \*pāḥ- or \*pāḥ- "fragrance": cf. BHeb. *pūḥā* "to puff, blow, breath", in Syr. "to refresh, to cool", esp. *the air by a breeze*, CA *fāḥa* "be fragrant, to breathe odors" id. (OT, 837). The CA verb occurred twice in this poem:

«...*fāḥa*-t kamā fāḥa *tuffāḥun* bi lubnāni», where the meaning of the verb is "to diffuse fragrance".

Egyp. 'twtw "a kind of wood" (EHD I, 12) ~ t'twtw id. (EHD II, 821), CA *tūtu* [twṭ] "mulberry tree". The Egyp. and CA words are not cognates.

2) An additional and unquestionable compound containing PHS \*tw- ~ \*dw- "tree" is CA *duwādimu*, consisting of \*duw- "tree" and damu "blood" (§2.1.14.1, n. 3h above).

3) CA *findu* "branch of a tree" is a compound of a stem [fan] and a proot [-d-], perh. from an earlier /-t/ (§2.9 below). The stem is present in *fananu* [fn] sg. or pl. "a branch", in *Hadith* "main branch of a tree" as in «*yasīru ('a)r rākibu fī ḍilli ('a)l fanani mā'ata sanati*»; *fannā'u* [fny/fnw] "a branching tree"; *fanwā'u* "a tree with long branches". For its BHeb. cognate, see OT, 857.

**2.7.21** BHeb. tā'ab "to desire, long after" (OT, 1093), with prefixed y-: OffAram. y'b "to desire" (NWSI I, 431) < CA 'abba "to long for"; 'abbu "nostalgia, longing for", Egyp. 'b, 'bb "to long for, desire, wish" (EHD I, 4), BHeb. 'ābā "to desire, breathe after; to want, need" (OT, 4), OffAram. 'by "désirer", Jp. 'abā "vouloir", Bab. 'abāyāy "prière" (DRS I, 3).

**2.7.22** Pun. tkd "to decide" (NWSI II, 1213) = CA ta'akkada CV of ['kd] "make sure, ascertain": wakkada ~ 'akkada "to confirm, affirm; reassure"; 'akīdu "for sure" < Sab. 'k "be reassured" (SD, 4). See §2.17.10, n. 2 below.

**2.7.23** CA tabāba "ruin, destruction" as in the Koran (40:37): PHS stem \*yab- (§2.2.3

above).

**2.7.24** Assy. *tarbītu* “child, offspring” (King, 1898: 384), Pun. *trbh* “offspring” (NWSI II, 1229), CA *tirbu* (usu. fem.), defined by LA [trb] as «*lida-tu and sinnu*», i.e. ‘birth and age’, as in *This (fem.) is tirbu of this (fem.)* = (were) both born on the same day, i.e. *of the same age*; pl. ‘*atrābu* “females of the same age” as in the Koran: (قاصرات الطرف أترابا), *And with them will be (females) of modest gaze, equals in age* (38:52). It is evident that the word is based on \*rab- as in *rabbā* “to bring up, let grow up, raise, breed”; ‘*urbiyatu* “family, household”, Sab. *hrbb caus.* “bring up a foster child” (SD, 114) = CA CIV ‘*arabba id.*, BHeb., Syr. *rbh* “bring up, let grow up” (OT, 958), also in NWS *rby* “boy, girl” (NWSI II, 1054), Mand. *rabia* “boy, child”, fem. *rabita*, etc.

1) Among numerous derivatives of [trb] one has attracted my attention, namely ‘*atraba*, which looks like a CIV stem and strangely expresses “to own a slave who has already been enslaved for *three times*”. This is from [tr-] “three” (?) and rab- as in CA *rabba* “to own, possess”; *marbūbu* “slave” as in «*wa (’a)l ’ibādu ma-rbūbūna li llāhi*». The change of \*θl-b- to \*tr-b- involves both \*θ > t and \*l > r, and the former change causes the latter to undergo change. For what concerns the first change, it is not a big issue, since the interchange of /θ/ and /t/ is quite common in CA, hence one can actually say or write *taribā-tu* or *θaribā-tu* “fingers”, etc. As for the second change, it seems to be due to *seq. const.* since it is impossible to have a sequence \*/t l b/ in the language without an intervening semivowel /y, w, or ’/. It is true that LA cites ‘*itla’abba* “stand erect” and *tawlabu* “young of donkey”, but “young of cow”, according to Bin Faris (ML I, 364), who considers [tlb] as being from [wlb] and ‘*itla’bba* as an invented term. Bin Faris’ view on ‘*itla’abba* as being from [wlb] is correct, but ‘*as a recent coinage*’ seems to be inaccurate since the word appears in PIP: Labid says:

«fa ’awradahā masġūratan taḥta yābatin  
mina (’a)l ḵurnatayni wa ’itla’abba yaḥūmu».

2) The CA word is linguistically identical with Lat. *tribus* and Umbr. *trifu* “tribe”, which are, according to Buck (SS: §19.23):

«from \*tribhu-, prob. deriv. of \*tri- “three” and denoting orig. a tripartite division. But substantial historical evidence of this is lacking, and the precise history of the Roman tribus is difficult».

It is also to be noted that CA *turba-tu* fem. “soil, cemetery”; *turābu* “soil, dust” and Akk. *tarbu’tu id.* are also semantically and phonologically similar to Goth. *þaurp* “field”, ON., OE. *þorp* “village”, OW. *treba* “dwelling”, Lat. *turba* “crowd”.

The notion of ‘slave’ in CA seems to be related to or developed from ‘*orphan*’ and is preserved in *rabraba* by reduplication “to raise an orphan”; *rābbu* “guardian of an orphan” also “husband of an orphan’s mother”: \*rab- as in CA *marabbu* “place of dwelling and gathering; place”; CIV ‘*arabba* “to settle in a place, to dwell”.

3) The \*t- in CA *tirbu*, pl. ‘*atrābu* above seems to be linguistically different from the prefixed /t-/ under study, and it is the same as \*t- in §2.7.2 above.

**2.7.25** CA *tawā* “death, perishing” > “loss, destruction”; ‘*atwā* “to perish” (Al ‘ayn VIII, 2143-144; LA), OArām. *twy* is of uncertain meaning, perh. desert, wilderness, crop-

consuming insect, (i.e. *one causing loss*), etc. (NWSI II, 1206), Chad.: Kera tay “hunger” (HSED, n. 2381): CA tawan id., Egyp. tw “disease” (EHD II, 824). All are possibly from PHS proots \*ta- and \*wy- “woe, alas” (see §2.14.4 below). However, the special meaning of ‘death’ the word signifies in CA, i.e. *perishing of animals one owns*, hence also *loss*, esp. in a neg. sentence like *lā tawā* “no loss” and in CIV ’atwā “make perish, get lost” may suggest the presence of a proot \*ta- “death”. To this proot may possibly belong Egyp. ’t “loss, diminution”. It should be added that wt “embalm” in Egyp. presupposes the presence of a dead body to embalm (CA wty ~ twy “death > die”).

**2.7.26** CA ta’aqa, CIV ’at’aqa “to fill to the extreme or to excess (water)” as in the PIP of Nabīyh:

«yandaḥna nadḥa (’a)l mazādi (’a)l wufri ’at’aqa-hā

šaddu (’a)r ruwāti bi-mā’ in ḡayra ma-šrūbi» (DN, p. 20, L. 1).

Meh. tīḡ “trinken”, Chus.: Ga. duga id., Bur. tiy, Chad.: Sok. tāgo “essen” (Müller, 1975: 69, n. 69). For the proot \*Wḡ-, see §2.6.10 above.

**2.7.27** CA tur’a-tu fem. [r. tr’] “brook-mouth, streamlet-mouth” also “water-course”. According to Azhari, tur’a-tu, said of a basin, “the opening through which water flows out”. The trilateral is a compound of at least three proots \*t-, \*r- “opening, mouth”, and \*’-. This is, without prefixed \*t-, = Egyp. r-’ “canal”.

a) On the other hand, one of the common significations of [tr’] in HS is “gate, door” as in OffAram., Palm., Hatra, Nab. tr’ “door (of a gate), gate” (NWSI II, 1232-1233), Egyp. tiry’ “door, two leaves of a door”, Syr., BAram. tr’ “gate” (EHD II, 823). In CA tur’a-tu expresses “stair, step” also “elevated place” (tal’a-tu “elevated place” also “water-course”)<sup>107</sup>.

b) PHS had a compound stem \*ra’- “door” and is seen in Sem. [šr’] in such derivatives as Sab. mšr’t, mšr’y “leaf of door; door, gate” (SD, 144) = CA mišrā’u inst. sg., mišrā’ā(n) ~ mišrā’ay [šr’] dual. “leaf of door”.

c) Another trilateral based on \*ra’- and having to do with “gate, door” is seen in DAram. šr’ “gate” (NWSI II, 1193): CA šarra’a CII “open up (two leaves of doors)”; mu-šra’a-tu adj., said of doors, “open”. One of the basic root meanings of CA [šr’] is to “to start, begin”.

*Is HS [ra’] the same as that of [par’ or pir’u] ‘first’* (see §2.3.13 above)? Note that far’a-tu fem. “one leaf of a door; one of two”.

**2.7.28** Akk. te’iḡtu [t’ḡ] “injury, damage” (NWSI II, 1225) is from the root in Palm. ’ḡ “anguish” (NWSI II, 881), Egyp. ’ḡ “destroy” (EHD I, 139), CA ’aḡḡa, etc. see §2.1.6.5.2, n. 2b above.

**2.7.29** Pun. tlmd “student”, CA tilmīḡu [tlmḡ] (LA) “pupil, student”, tatalmaḡa “to become a pupil, receive knowledge”, Ug. lmd “to learn”; tlmd “pupil” (UG, 533, 535),

<sup>107</sup> Gray (1971: §51) identifies it with Heb. tō’ālāh (by metathesis) “water-course”. Gesenius (OT, 1112), however, derives the Heb. word from [’lh].

Assyr. lamādu “to learn, receive” (King, 1898: 357), BHeb. lmd “to learn; be taught, to accustom” (OT, 522), Ge. lāmādā “be accustomed”, Amh. lāmmādā, Tna. lāmādā, Te. lāmda “become accustomed, to study”, Har. lāmāda “to study, learn”, E., En., Ed., Gt. nām(m)ādā “to love” (EHD, 100).

1) One may assume that Semitic \*lmδ or \*lmd is based on a word \*lam- as in CA CIV ’alamma (bikaḏā = of a thing) “to become acquainted with; grasp; learn”; ’ilmāmu “general knowledge, acquaintance”; mulimmu “acquainted with”, but this is not one of the basic meanings of [lm]. The central meaning of the root [lm] is “gather together (with the hand)”.

1a) Intuition tells that the original proot lying beneath [lmδ] is \*-m- “know, teach”, see”, preserved in the Koranic word ’umma-tan (see §2.3.8 above), and that \*/l-/ is a separate proot similar to /’-/ of [’lm] below.

2) CA ’alima “to know”; CII ’allama “to teach”; CV ta’allama “to learn, study”, Sab. ’lm “make acknowledgment”; t’lm “take notice ~ cognizance of s.o./s.t.”; st’lm “to acknowledge” (SD, 15). The trilateral is also found in other Semitic languages as in Ug. ’lm “learned”, BHeb., with prefixed neg. ne-, ne’ēlam “be unknown” (Rabin, 1975: 90, n. 45).

A traditional derivative of [’lm] is Sab. ’lm “world” (SD, 15), CA ’ālamu id. = Phoen., Pun., OAram., EHeb. ’lm “eternity” (NWSI II, 859). In Tham. ’lm “tracer, écrire; signe” (Branden, 1950: 517) = CA ’allama “to mark”; ’alāma-tu “a mark, sign”.

1b) It is worth-noting that Sab. t’lm above = CA ’alima or ’ahaḏa (= take) ’ilm-an “to take notice”, whereas the two other Sab. forms correspond semantically to CA CVIII ’i’arafa “to acknowledge” from ’arafa “to know” (Syr. ’rp id., etc.: see *Comments* below). Besides, CA CX st’lm = “to inquire”, i.e. *make oneself know*.

1c) The origin of [’lm] is seen in Eyp. ’m “to know”, Copt. imi id., Chad. Tangale yim-, Pero yim “to think”, Mubi ’um “to see” (HSED, n. 1103). Accordingly, the radical /-l-/ in these two roots as well as in hundreds others is a product of dissimilation (see §2.17.80 below). As to the origin of /’-/ it is most likely a proot [’aW-], and this proot will be studied in §2.14 below.

### *Comments*

The Sab. cognate of CA ’arafa “to know” seems to be [γrb] id., which also signifies “be aware of, recognize” (SD, 54). To my knowledge, CA [γrb] has nothing to do with “knowledge”. In my opinion, the CA trilateral corresponding to that of Sab. is [’rb] “to analyze, express, make evident, point out” also “to pledge” as in all other Semitic languages, Cush.: Som. ’arrab “tongue”, Ga. arrāb Sid. arrabo, Kam. arrabīta id. (HED, 32). A change in the order of radicals /’ r b/ gives rise to a new trilateral [’br] as in CA ’abbara “to express, make clear” also “respect” = Phoen. b-’br “thanks to, by the grace of” (NWSI II, 823).

The following additional study of both [γrb] and [’rb] in Semitic languages will confirm or refute the claim.

A derivative of CA [γrb] is γirbību “black grapes”<sup>108</sup> = Sab. γrb “a kind of raisin wine” (SD, 54). Another derivative is CA γurābu masc. “crow” = Akk. āribu id., Mand. ‘urba id. (MD, 346), BHeb., BAram., Syr. ‘rb id. (OT, 814), so called in CA and other Semitic languages from its *black color*: cf. BHeb. ‘ārab “to be or grow dark, to draw toward sunset or evening”, CA γaraba “to set (of the sun)”; γurūbu “sunset, evening”; γarbu “the occident, west” (OT, 814), OAram. ‘rb “sunset, west” (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 6), Assyr. erēbu “to set (of the sun)” (King, 1898: 331).

It does not seem likely that a notion like “to know” in Sab. or “to express, analyze” in CA is from “black, dark”. In accordance with this fact, Sab. /γ-/ is from /ʿ-/.

**2.7.30** OffAram. twnh, Palm. twn’, JAram. twnh, Nab. twny’ “room, chamber” (NWSI II, 1206-1207). All are from a proot [ʿaw] as in Egyp. yw, yi “house”, ’wy “house” “room, house”, Copt. ēi id. (Hodge, 1975: 180), with n-ext.: Egyp. ywn “inner room”, ywnnw “abode, home” (EHD I, 34), Chad.: Kariya iyu “place”, Cagu, Mburku yī id. (HSED, n. 2590), Lih. ’w “to seek shelter, to lodge”, CA ’āwā “to lodge”, and with the same n-ext. noted in Egyp.: OAram. ’wyn “to seek refuge, seek shelter”, Syr., Mand. ’wn “dwelling place”, Palm., Nab. ’wn “habitation, abode” (DRS I, 12).

**2.7.31** Akk. tārū “guard, supervisor”, in Assyr. “protector”, in Mand., Syr. “to instruct, discipline, warn” (MD, 490). Here belongs Akk. tērtu(m) “instruction, directive”, in Assyr. “law, command, divine oracle”, Aram. ’ōrāytā, BHeb. tōrā “instruction, precept; law”: hōrā, *Hiph* of [yry], “to teach, instruct” (OT, 424), Sab. h-wry “to announce, proclaim” (SD, 57), Ge. waraya “dire les nouvelles, raconteur”, Tna. ’awrāyā, Amh. ’awārā “donner des nouvelles”, Te. wāra “annoncer”, etc. (DRS IV, 627) = CA rawā “to narrate, relate, tell”. All are related to OAkk. (w)arū “to lead, guide”, and all are from the root in CA ra’ā “to see”, ’arā “to show”, EHeb., DAram., Pun. r’y “to see”; *Hiph*. “to show”; NWS rwy “to speak, to answer” (NWSI II, 1041, 1063), Sab. hr’yt “oracular vision”, from caus. hr’y “to show to s.o.”: r’y “to see” (SD, 113). Here also belong Chad., Housa yārē “word, speech”, Som. ’eeray, ’eeray id., Sumray “to see”, Cush.: Ometo ’er-, Bil. ar’- “to know”, etc. see §§2.7.11 above; 2.10.11 below; 2.17.2 below, etc.

**2.7.32** Egyp. tys “to sit”, Chad.: Sha tās “put down” (HSED, n. 2407): PHS proot \*θ- (see §2.9.18 below).

**2.7.33** CA tā’a or taya’a [r. ty’] “to flow, to thaw”; ’atā’a “make vomit” (Al ’Ayn II, 227) CVI tatāya’a “to wander, go aimlessly” (Al ’Ayn II, 226-227; LA), Eth.: Te. ’ātwa “to pour (of rain)”: Chad.: Angas ta “to ooze”, Tangale ti “to rain”, Cush.: Oromo to’a “to draw water” (HSED, n. 2354).

1. Another trilateral expressing a similar meaning is tayā [r. tyy] “to perish, pass away”, BHeb. tā’ā “to perish” also “to go astray, to wander, to err”, Arm. t’y “to go astray, to wander”. In CA ṭayā also expresses “to go astray, to wander, to err” and “to

<sup>108</sup> CA zabību “withered grapes, dry grapes”, lit. and orig. meaning: ḏāwī “withering” (’al = the) ’inab, the gen. HS term for “grapes”.

seduce, entice”<sup>109</sup>; γiyya-tu “illegitimate” in the phrase ’ibin (= son) γiyya-tu “illegitimate child”, i.e. *son of adultery*, BAram. ṭə’ā “to be given to adolatry”, in Syr. “to be a heretic”.

2) One may ask whether the three trilaterals are related? To my knowledge they are not: [ty’] is from \*θ- and \*y’ “to flow, to go > to perish”, and [ṭyy ~ ṭyy] is clearly from \*t- and \*γay.

3. The trilateral [ty’] also expresses “to spew, vomit” as in tā’a, and this seems to be based on ‘(’) as SL ya’, which said when seeing *something so filthy and disgusting that it makes one vomit*, Egyp. “filth” (EHD I, 113). The proot is preserved in CA with prefixed /h-/ as in ha’a [h’] and hā’a [hw’] id. < θā’a [r. θy’] “to flow” θa’a “to spew, vomit”. It is also the very same proot seen in sā’a “to flow”. The phonetic split of /θ-/ into [θ-], [t-], and [s-] has given rise in the course of time to three roots. This is a widespread phenomenon in Semitic, esp. in CA. A similar example of phonemic split is CA ma’aθa “to rub a hide” > ma’asa ~ ma’aša id.

**2.7.34** CA *tauḳu* [twḳ], said of the soul, “longing or yearning for, strong desire” as a vb tāḳa (Al ‘Ayn V, 199). See §§2.12.5, n. b & 2.12.17 below.

Another trilateral expressing a similar meaning is seen in CA *šauḳu*, also said of the soul, “longing or yearning for, strong desire”; CVIII *’išṭāḳa*, CI *šāḳa* “to long for, desire, yearn for, miss”; *tašauwuḳu* “longing, desire”, BHeb. šūḳ “to run after anything, to desire, to long for”; təšūḳā “desire, longing” (OT, 1042, 1119). The trilateral is a compound of [ša-] (see §2.11.8, ft.<sup>1</sup> below) and [-ḳ] = -ḳ of [twḳ] above. This is the very same form seen in Egyp. š’ḳīḳ “to delight in (CA n. šaiyīḳ) ~ š’k’īk’ “passion”.

**2.7.35** Egyp. tw’k’ “to destroy” = SL tauwak “to damage” (see §2.10.17, n. a below).

<sup>109</sup> The most widely used word in CA expressing “to seduce, entice” is ’ayrā CIV of [ryy], and is from [γay] (see §2.1.6.5.14 above).



## 2.8 PHS INFIXED /-t-/

The infix /-t-/ is used to derive verbs from verbs as in CA CVIII yartaḥīdu, Ug. yrthš “he washes himself” (CA raḥada, Ug. rḥš “to wash”), Sab. ʿtkr “become fertile” (ʿkr “become pregnant”), etc. (see §2.1.7.3 above). It also used to form nouns from such derived verbs as in CA ʾiktisābu “earning, acquisition” (ʾiktasaba “to earn”) as well as adjectives as in Akk. itbāru “very friendly” (ibru “friend”), and nouns from verbs as in Assy. atmū “word, speech” (amū “to speak”).

There is another infixed -t-, the subject of our investigation, added to a biliteral root {XZ} to form either a substance or a ground form of a verb according to the pattern {XvtvZ-}(v = a vowel). From this first class of verbs several other classes of verbs and substances may be derived. The part of speech of {XZ} was most likely a substance, and in many cases this substance has survived in some Semitic languages, esp. in CA. Presumably the two infixes are two sides of the same coin, both are inserted after the first radical.

1) As one may expect, the infixed \*-t- may sometimes become voiced \*-d- or emphatic \*-ṭ-. The two types of change are regular in CA: /-t-/ > /-d-/ when preceded by /z/ or /ḍ/ as in CVIII ʾizdahara “to prosper, flourish” from \*ʾiztahara, a sequence impossible to pronounce, and /-t-/ > /-ṭ-/ when preceded by an emphatic consonant like /ḏ/ and /ṣ/ as in CVIII ʾiḏtaraba “be disturbed, agitated, embarrassed” is from \*ʾiḏtaraba: ḏaraba “to strike, beat”, CVIII ʾiṣṭafā “to choose (for oneself)” is from \*ʾiṣṭafā: [ṣfy].

2) An illustrative example of infixed \*-t- becoming \*-d- may be CA ḥadasa “to conjecture, to guess, surmise”; ḥadsu, often termed as *the sixth sense* (mind’s power), is from \*ḥts > ḥds because of seq. const. It is indeed impossible to pronounce \*ḥatasa, \*ḥatsu. PHS stem \*ḥas- “to feel, think, perceive” as in OAkk. hss “to think” (Gelb, 1961: 179), Assy. hasāsu “to think, conceive, set in the memory” (King, 1898: 348), BHeb. ḥwš “feel, enjoy”, Palm. ḥšʾ, Amorite Yi-iḥ-si-an, etc. (Shehadeh, 1968: 169), CA ḥassa “to feel, perceive”; ʾiḥsāsu “sensation, sense, knowledge through senses”; ḥissu “perception”. The biliteral also means “caress, stroke (lightly)” as in CA ḥassasa id., Har. ḥāsāsa id., Ge. ḥasāyā “to rub”, Tna. ḥāsāsā, ḥasāyā id., Te. ḥasa, ḥasḥasa, Arg. hašša, etc. (HED, 88), SL ḥass also expresses “to touch”, from “to feel of”. It is most surprising to find that this same meaning is denoted by the biliteral in compound words (e.g. see §2.17.44 below).

It is worth-noting that ḥissu also denotes in CA “a sound or voice you hear but you don’t see the one who produces it” (Al ʿAyn III, 16), in SL, it is often “unidentified voice, sound” and “unidentified noises (loud or low)” with no pl. form or even a verbal form. In the phrase: ḥiss ḥelw<sup>110</sup> lit. “sweet singing sound” = Egyp. ḥssw “praises, hymms of praise, songs”; ḥs “to sing, to chant” (EHD I, 508), Cush.: Ga. hasaw “causer, jouer”, Som. hēs “chant”, hasaw “causer”, Sid. hasaw id. (VPHS, 99, n. 101).

3) One marked characteristic of infixed /-t-/ is its continual tendency to become part

<sup>110</sup> ḥelw = sweet, pleasant: CA ḥulwu id., in Syr. id., in Eth. “to sing”, in BHeb. “to polish, rub smooth”: OT, 315.

of the root throughout the historical development of Hamito-Semitic, a tendency which is immensely old, precisely as old as Early PHS, if not indeed much older. For example, the /-t-/ in CA *satana*<sup>111</sup> or *lātabu*<sup>112</sup> is relatively recent, while /-t-/ in Semitic [ʔtd] (see §2.8.1 below) is older, whereas that of Semitic [str] (see §2.8.13 below) or *satala* (§2.8.19 below) is much older, but that of Egyp. ptr “to see” (EHD I, 254) is the oldest (see §§2.2.17, 2.3.13, n. 5 above).

4) CA CVIII stems are formed by infixing /-t-/ after the first root radical, and this /-t-/ regularly becomes emphatic /-ṭ-/ after such consonants as /š- and ḏ-/ (see n. 1 above). We assert that this very same stem existed in Egyp., as for example, *stp* (~ *sṭp*) “to choose, select”; *stpw* “the ‘choicest’, best” (EG, 593; EHD II, 710) = CA *mu-ṣṭafā* id., CVIII *ʔiṣṭafā* (from *ʔiṣṭafā*; [r. ṣfy]) “to select, choose”. For CA *s* ~ *ṣ* < PSem. \*š ~ \*ṣ, see §3.2.48 above.

5) As a result of interchange of /t/, /ṭ/, and /d/, we should be prepared to see roots having been brought into existence as a result of this interchange, e.g. CA *matta*, *maṭṭa*, *madda* “stretch”, *mītāʔu* ~ *mīdāʔu* “the measure of”, etc. Egyp. *tns* ~ *dns* “be heavy”, *tg* ~ *dg* “see, look at”, etc.

**2.8.1** BAram. ʔtd “ready, prepared” (Rosenthal, 1963: 93), OffAram., Nab. ʔtd “to prepare” (NWSI, II, 897), BHeb., Syr. ʔtd “to prepare, to make ready”, Mand. ʔtit “prepared, ready, established” (MD, 358; Ryder, 1974: 101), Sab. ʔtd “to provide with” (SD, 22), CA ʔatada “be ready, to prepare” as in the Koran: (وَأَعْتَدْنَا لِلْكَافِرِينَ عَذَابًا مُهِينًا), *We have prepared for the disbelievers an ignominious torment* (4:37): PHS stem [ʔad] as in CA ʔadda, ʔaʔadda “to prepare, to be ready, to provide with”. Also belong here CA ʔadā ~ ʔadā “to prepare” = Egyp. ʔd id. (EHD I, 14).

**2.8.2** CA ʔatana “to jail, to treat with violence and injure or harm, to oppress”; ʔatinu “harsh, fierce”: PHS [ʔan] as in CA ʔannā, CIV ʔa-ʔannā, “to capture and imprison”; ta-ʔnīnu “jail”, ʔanā “be subjugated, subdued, humbled”, Phoen., Moab., JAram ʔny “to subdue, oppress” (NWSI II, 876), Assy. enū “to overcome, humble” (King, 1898: 330), Egyp. ʔn “to beseech as a captive, cry out” (EHD I, 124), Sab. ʔnw “be distressed, troubled” (SD, 17), Chad.: Bokkos han “ache”, Mokilko ʔeni “illness” (HSED, n. 1068): see §2.2.57.1 above.

a) The prefix /-t-/ can also occurs as a suffix in CA, thus creating an additional triliteral [ʔnt] as in ʔanatu “trouble, distress, hardship, wrong”; ʔanata “be troubled, subdued,

<sup>111</sup> CA ʔasanata [r. snw, snh] “to enter upon the year” is from sana-tu fem. “year”, gen. Sem. id.. Speakers here quickly forgot that the final -tu is a fem. marker and treated it as part of the root. Having made this mistaken assumption, they prefixed the caus. ʔa- to create a new stem and new root. Shifting /-t-/ to medial position, as in ʔastana, does not result, as we should expect, in any change in meaning; it just introduces a new triliteral [stn] (LA).

<sup>112</sup> The verb *lataba* signifies “to thrust the lower front part of neck” (§HH I, 216-217) and is from *labba-tu* “lower front part of neck”. As for *lātibu*, it is also from [lb] as in *labba*, CIV ʔalabba “to dwell in and stick to a place”; *labbu* “adhering to, sticking to”.

humbled”, occurred once in the Koran with the signification “be humbled, subdued” as in (وَعَنْتَ الْوُجُوهُ لِلْحَيِّ الْقَيُّومِ) , *And (all) faces shall be humbled before the Ever-Living, The Self-Subsistent* (20: 111).

**2.8.3** CA ‘atā [r. ‘ty] “be advanced in age”; ‘itiyyā “stricken in years” as in the Koran (19: 8): بلغت من العمر عتياً; ‘a’yā “be/become faint, weak”; ‘aiy, said of a disease, “incurable”; ‘aiyu, ‘ayā’u “faintness, disability, inability, weakness, fatigue” as in the PIP of Nabiyah:

«’a’ya-t ḡawāban wa mā bi (’a)l rabi’i min ’aḥadi».

Tham. ‘y “be fatigue” (Branden, 1950: 516), Moab. ‘y “ruin” (NWSI II, 838), BHeb. ‘ay “(heaps of) ruins” (OT, 770), perh. Egyp. ’w “be old” (EHD I, 3).

**2.8.4** CA ‘atara “be moved, shaken”: PHS [‘ar] as in CA ‘ar’ara, with reduplication, “to move and shake”, OffAram. ‘rr “to stir up, incite” (NWSI II, 889-900). PHS stem \*’ar- is also seen with different extensions below in §§2.8.5, 2.8.6, 2.8.8, & 2.11.19, etc.

**2.8.5** CA ‘utrufānu “cock” < ‘urfu “cockscorn, crest, mane”, Assy. aruppu “mane” (Albright, JAOS, 47, 205, n. 4) < ‘ur’urah, with reduplication, “top, summit (of a mountain)” (SHH II, 742-743; LA), Sab. ‘rr “mountain” (SD, 20), Ug. ṛr id. (UG, 534), Egyp. ‘r “to ascend” (EG, 122), etc.

**2.8.6** Phoen. ‘ṭr “to crown”; ‘ṭrt “crown, wreath”, Pun. ‘ṭr “gable; crown, wreath” (NWSI II, 838), BHeb. ‘iṭēr “to encircle with a crown, to crown; a crown” (OT, 769) = CA ‘tr (see §2.19.28 below). All are derived from the notion “high” as expressed by PHS [‘ar] (§§2.8.4-5 above).

**2.8.7** BHeb. ‘ātar “to burn incense to a divinity”, in Syr. ‘tr “to smoke with perfume; fume, incense”, CA ‘iṭru “incense, perfume” ~ ‘itru “a kind of perfume”: PHS [‘ar] “to kindle a fire, burn” (§2.2.56.3 above).

Ge. ‘əṭan “incense”, Har. əṭān “incense”; aṭān “fumigate”, etc. are connected by Leslau (HED, 37) with CA ‘ṭr “perfume”. Also, CA ‘aṭnu “maceration”, ‘uṭba-tu fem. “burned piece of cloth”, SL ‘aṭanē “smell of maceration”, whereas ‘uṭbē “smell of burned piece of cloth”.

In addition, Semitic also has [‘θn] as in CA ‘aṭanu, ‘uṭānu “smoke of fire” and its pl. form is strangely ‘awāṭinu, which is, according to LA, one of only two plural forms found in the language, the other being dawāḥinu, pl. of duḥānu “smoke”. The pl. form bears a clue to the ultimate origin of the root (see §2.17.1 below), EHeb. ‘šn “smoke” as in yyn ‘šn “smoked wine” (NWSI II, 891-892). The Heb. phrase shows that /’šn/ extends \*wyn ‘wine’ = CA waynun ‘aṭin, where ‘aṭin adj. signifies “bad smell of smoke”.

**2.8.8** BHeb. ‘tr “to pray as a supplicant, to supplicate God” (OT, 831). The triliteral finds its cognate in Sab. ‘tl “to importune deity with prayers”: PHS stem \*’al- as in BHeb., Sab., CA, Akk, etc. gen. Semitic “high, supreme”. In CA the derived triliteral [‘tl] is seen in ‘attālu “porter, i.e. one who carries baggage, etc. on his back or

*shoulders*”, from ‘alā, ‘alla “to raise, lift up”. Other derivatives are ‘atala-tu “a metal bar used to move and lift rocks from land” and (SL) ma-‘tal “bier”, so-called because it is raised on hands; ‘attāl “a person employed to carry luggages, etc. on his upper back or head”.

My view on BHeb. ‘tr and Sab.-CA ‘tl as being cognate and ultimately derived from PHS [‘al], should neither give the wrong impression that PHS had no stem [‘ar] expressing an identical meaning and deriving into [‘tr], nor that CA has lost such a derivative of [‘ar]. Starting from the last point, CA has preserved the original part of speech of [‘tr] and its signification: ‘itru (*Itru*) “idol, deity”; ‘afīra-tu “a sacrifice offered to *Itru* in propitiation every Raġab (name of a month) and its blood is poured on *Itru*’s head” as in the PIP of Zuhair Bin Abi Salma:

«...kanāṣibi (‘a)l ‘itru damman ra’sahu (‘a)n nusuku».

In this case, as in many other cases, the difference in phonetic composition between /l/ and /r/ is neutralized. A scientific study of this phenomenon must take into consideration two levels of phonological structure, *the surface* and *the deep*. At the former level one can easily cite hundreds of minimal pairs illustrating the contrast between /l/ and /r/ in all positions of occurrence. At the deep level, however, the number is severely decreased. This observation holds even truer for voiced/voiceless pairs of consonants like [p] and its voiced counterpart [b], /k/ and /g/, and so on.

**2.8.9** Ug. ktp “shoulder, side” (UG, 531), BHeb. ktp “shoulder” also “side”, BAram., Syr. ktp “shoulder”, CA katifu “shoulder” also “side”, Mand. kadpa “shoulder” (OT, 498; MD, 195). All are derived from PHS [kap] “hand, side” as in CA kaffu, Ug. kp “hand, palm of the hand” (UG, 531, 533), OAram. kp “hand” (AG, 11), etc. see §2.3.10, esp. n. a above. Evidence proving that such derivation is correct comes from CA katafa, kattafta “to tie *the hands* to the back”; CV takattafta “to fold one’s arms”, etc. Such examples show clearly that “*shoulder*” is derived from “*hand*”.

**2.8.10** Te. kättäfa “to cut to pieces”, Har. kätäfa “to hash, cut into pieces, chop”, Te. kättäfa “to cut in pieces”, SE. ktf “to hash” (HED, 96): CA kattafta “to cut (e.g. meat) into pieces”, perh. from \*kaffa “to cut from the end”, surviving in kaffu, a grammatical term denoting “elimination of the seventh radical in prosody”, kaffa “to hem” also “to shorten”, Eyp. kf “knife” (EHD II, 793). Besides, CA kaiyafa CII of \*kayafa [kyf] “to cut”; kafa-tu “a piece”, also “the piece of cloth used to patch the back of a dress’s train”. The notion ‘edge, side of, end’ seems to be central, and cannot be expressed here by any proot other than [-f].

**2.8.11** CA rata’a “to graze, pasture” (= ra’ā and its CVIII ‘irta’ā id.) also “to enjoy”, as in the Koran: as in the Koran: (ارسله معنا غدا يرتع ويلعب), *Send him with us tomorrow to enjoy himself and play* (12: 12); marta’u “luxuriant pasture”; marta’a-tu fem. “fertility” as in the proverb: «waḡa’ti fī marta’atin fa’īṯī» (Nisabūriy, MA II, p. 372, n. 4414); rat’u “abundance of fertility; wealth”, Sab. rt’ “troops”, Akk. retū “be fortified”, Ge. rāt’a “be straight”, Tna. rāt’e “to win”, Te. rāt’a “become wealthy, win”, Har. rāta’a “to win in law suit”, Amh., Arg. rätta “to win” (EHD, 135): PHS stem [ra’] as in Akk. rē’u

“to pasture, graze” also “to rule”, Ug. r’ “to pasture, graze”, Sab. yrt’nn id., CA ra’ā id.

For Akk. retū: cf. CA ra’ā “to guard, protect” and for Sab. rt’: cf. CA ra’iy-yatu “followers, subjects, people”, Egyp. r’ “ruler” (EHD I, 418) = Akk.-Assyr. rē’u “shepherd” also “to rule”, CA rā’ī “shepherd” also “ruler” and “one who guards and guides people” (LA).

From PHS stem [ra’] another trilateral [mr’] has developed in CA by adopting a prefix /m-/ = “place of” as in mari’u = marta’u above = “fertile place”; mara’u “pasture, herbage” = ma-r’ā id. as in the Koran: (والذي أخرج المرعى), *And he who brings forth the herbage* (87: 4); IV ’amara’a ~ ’arta’a “to find a pasture” (Al ’Ayn II, 140; LA).

**2.8.12** Akk. šatū “to drink”, Ug. šty, BHeb. šātāh, Syr. eštī id. (Rabin, 1975: 87, n. 19), OAram. šty “to drink”; štw’ “winter”, JAram., DA, Samal, OffAram., Palm. šty “to drink” (NWSI II, 1198, Dupont-Sommer, AG, 7), BAram. šty id. (Rosenthal, 1963: 98), Sab. ms’ty “drink” (SD, 129), CA šitā’u “rain, winter”: šatā “to rain”, Ge. sātyä “to drink”, Har. sāča, Tna. sätäyä, Te. sāta, S., W. sāče, etc. id. (HED, 137). All are from PHS [šay] or [šaw] “water; to drink”.

This root is common to all Hamitic language groups, and, on the Semitic side, is preserved intact, as one should expect, in CA: cf. Egyp. sw, s’w “to drink” (EHD II, 692), Berb. su “to drink”, Chad. s- as in Housa šā, Mandara, Wadala ša “to drink”, Cush.: Sid. so “water”, Gangero, Badito, Basketo zay, Shinasha, Gimira uš id., etc. (Müller, 1975: 69, n. 68; VPHS, 142, n. 296), CA šai’u “water” also sa’sa’a ~ ša’sa’a, with reduplication, “to offer a drink, call a donkey to drink”; *sa’* imper. “drink!”.

The proot is seen in many CA compound words. For example, zu’āḡu “bitter water” is obviously from \*su- “water” and ‘aḡḡu “bitter”. The reason for which \*su- becomes zu- is also obvious; the language does not permit a sequence /s ‘ ḡ/.

#### Comments

The word šai’u “water” above is in actually uncommon and has rarely been used in written document throughout the history of the language. It occurred in this line of Poet. (of Layth):

«tarā rakbahu bi (’a)š šai’i fī waṣṭi ḡafratin» (LA).

On the other hand, the interchange of CA /š/ and /s/ is by itself evidence, unless proved to the contrary, that both sounds are from an earlier consonant different from either.

**2.8.13** Phoen. m-str “hiding-place” (NWSI, II, 666-7), BHeb., BAram. str “to hide, conceal”; Syr. str “to protect; veil, hiding place, secret” (OT, 735-736), CA satara “to hide, conceal”<sup>113</sup>; mastūru “hidden, concealed, unseen” as in the Koran: «ḡiḡāban mastūran» (17: 45), Ge. satara “to hide”, OSA h-str, caus., “to protect”, JAram., Palm. str “to hide”, OffAram. str “secret, secret place” (NWSI, II, 805): PHS stem [sar] “keep

<sup>113</sup> I guess that an earlier \*-k- has been lost here, and that the original form of the word may be \*stakara. If this hypothesis is true, then the proot is ultimately the same as that in §2.2.56.4 above.

secret; secret” as in CA sarra, ’asarra “to keep secret, hide”; sirru “secret”.

**2.8.14** Assy. katāmu “to cover” also “to close the lips”; kuttumu “to cover completely; covered, hidden” (King, 1898: 356), CA katama “to hide, conceal a secret, deaden sound”; CX ’istaktama “to confide a secret to” = kamā “to conceal, hide, cover”, etc.: PHS [kam] (see §2.1.9, n. 2, under *Comments* above).

**2.8.15** Ug. ktn “garment” (UG, 532), OArām. ktwn “cloak, garment” (Rosenthal, AG, 11), Phoen. ktn “flax, linen”, OffArām. ktn “flax, tunic, linen, garment” (NWSI, II, 547-548), Eth. ktn “to cover, hide; tunic”, BHeb. kātan “tunic”, BAram, Syr. ktn “flax, linen” (OT, 497-498), CA kattānu “flax, linen” and in a fixed expression «*labisa ’al-mā’u kattāna-hu*» = “cover(ing)”, sometimes occurred as katanu in pre-Islamic poetry to keep with the rhyme: A’sha said:

«huwa (’a)l wāhibu (’a)l musmi’āt (’a)š ša-  
rūbi baina (’a)l ḥarīri wa baina (’a)l *katan*».

Egyp. ktn “tunic” also Grk χιτώ (EHD II, 799). PHS stem [kan] “to cover; a cover, garment” as in CA *kanna*, *kanana* “to cover over, to protect by covering”; *kinnu* “whatever protects a person from heat, cold, animals & the like”, as in the PIP of Labid:

«wa bāta yurīdu (’a)l *kinna* law yastaṭī’ahu...» (DL, p. 115, L. 7).

Also, “house, home” as in the Koran (16: 81): *وجعل لكم من الجبال أكنا*; *kinānu* “a cover”.

**2.8.16** Akk. kadānu “to protect”, Ge., Tna. kādānā “cover”, Tna. kādānā, Te. kādna, Amh., Go., A. kāddānā(m) “thatch”, Har. xādānā “cover, thatch”, etc. (HED, 96), CA kidnu “cloak or garment used as a cover in a palanquin and fastened on the back of a camel”. All are from PHS stem \*kan- “to cover; a cover, garment” (§2.8.15 above).

**2.8.17** OAkk. btḫ “to break” (Gelb, 1961: 175), Assy. batāku “to rend, tear; to cut through, sever, separate”; batḫu “cleft, fissure” (King, 1898: 341), BHeb. btḫ “to slaughter” (Ryder, 1974: 109), CA bataka (\*bataḫa, for seq. const.) “to cut off, cleave asunder, cut in pieces”, Ge. bātaka “to break”, Te. bātka “to cut, to demolish”, Tna. bātākā “to slice” (DRS II, 90): PHS stem [baḫ] as in Egyp. bḫ “portion, fragment, share” (EHD I, 252), Ge. bḫḫ “to split”, Har. bāḫ “chaff”, Amh. əbbəḫ id., Cush.: Oromo baḫaḫa “to tear”, Gawwata paḫḫ- “to chop”, Chad.: Sura ḫak “to divide”, Angas bak “to cut”, Fyr bak “to split”, Dghwede ḫaka “to cut” (EHD, 43; HSED, n. 200).

To PHS [baḫ] also belong, with prefixed caus. š- becoming part of the root, OArām. šbḫ “to cleave” (Rosenthal, AG, 14), JAram. šbḫ “divorce” (NWSI II, 1105), etc.

#### *Comments I*

Hamito-Semitic evidence based on the above-mentioned trilaterals plainly points to the previous existence of a proot [baḫ]. In following such misleading evidence, we will find ourselves obliged to reconstruct for PHS some additional roots, which did exist in it as such, but only as derivatives of one single proot (see below). In other words, we will impose on PHS derivatives of a proot as separate proots. Before pinpointing the ultimate origin of [baḫ], let me first comment on ‘*Hamito-Semitic evidence*’ to show the reader

that it is deceptive.

Hamito-Semitic furnishes ample evidence compelling us to reconstruct another proot \*bar-<sup>114</sup>, which underlies [btr] as in Akk. *buturu* “to mutilate”, CA *batara* “to cut off from the root (the tail or limb)”, SL *batar* “to cut off a thing attached to s.t., *as tail, hand, leg, limb*”, BHeb. *bātar* “to cut in two or in pieces” (DRS II, 90; OT, 167-169), Sab. *btr* “childless woman” (SD, 33) = CA *batrā’u* fem., *’abtaru* masc. id. (Koran, 108: 3).

‘*Hamito-Semitic evidence*’ also strongly urges us to reconstruct another proot \*bat- to account for \*bat- as in Berb.: Ahaggar, Ayr *ə-bət* “to cut off, chop off”, Chad.: Bidiya *bit* “to strike” (HSED, n. 240), CA [bt] as in *batta* “to cut off the root of (anything)”; *batātu* “perdition, entire loss”, BHeb. *bātā* “desolation, from “separate (OT, 168) = CA [bth] id.

Shifting the position of /-t/ to initial position does not make any difference in meaning, hence CA *tabba* = *batta* and *tabābu* = *batātu*. Sem. \*bat-, like \*baḵ-, can take the caus. \*š, hence *sabata* “to cut off” also “to rest, i.e. *be separated from others*” (cf. CA *bt’* ~ *btw/bty* ~ *bθ’* “rest”): see §2.2.42 above, etc.

### Comments II

The foregoing discussion points to an earlier proot *ba(W)*-<sup>115</sup> signifying “to split, cut” and underlying all above-cited trilaterals. At this deepest level of analysis we should not be surprised to find that [voice] is not distinctive: cf. \*b’- = \*p’-. See §2.2.20 above and §2.8.18 below.

### Comments III

As has been mentioned above, CA has *bataka*, which may be from \*bataḵa. If one, however, insists on pronouncing the word with /-ḵ/, he will end up saying *fataḵa* “to rip open”, etc. see §3.8.18 below. It seems here, as in most other roots, that the difference in phonetic composition between /b/ and /p/ is neutralized. The thing to which *fataḵa* applies is *s.t. seen as one piece*, and its exact antonym is *rataḵa* (Al ‘Ayn V, 130). Accordingly, \*b- ~ \*p- = “apart (open), separate”.

**2.8.18** HS [ptḵ]: Syr. *ptḵ* “to tear asunder”, Mod. Heb. *ptḵ* id., Mand. *ptḵ* “to shoot”, Akk. *patāḵu* “to shape” (MD, 385), Assy. *patāḵu* “to create, shape” also “to make or mix (wine)” (King, 1898: 378) = CA *fataḵa* “to make or mix (perfume)”, Egy. *fdḵ* “to rip up, cut (off)” (EHD I, 263), Berb.: Ahaggar, Siwa *əftək* “to open”, Kabyl *eftek* id., Izy *ftek* id., Chad. Mofu *fətkw-* “to split”, Cush.: Oromo *fottoḵa* “to chip” (HSED, n. 2030), CA *fataḵa* “to rip open, to split into parts”; *fitḵu* “a small opening (e.g. in clouds)”. The Koranic *fataḵ-* in *kānatā* (they, i.e. *earth and sky*, were) *ritḵ-an* (one piece) *fa-fataḵ-nā-huma* (30: 21) “cleave asunder, rip open in order to make manifest”, hence *fatḵu* = beginning to peep (morning)” as in the PIP of Thu Rummah:

«wa ḵad lāḥa li (’a)s sārī (’a)l laḏī kammala (’a)s surā

’alā ’uḥrayāti (’a)l layli *fatkun* muṣaḥharu» (LA).

<sup>114</sup> As in BHeb. *bārā* “to cut, cut out, carve”, CA *barā* “to cut out, to cut or pare down”, etc.

<sup>115</sup> \*-W- is most likely a glottal stop

CIV 'aftaḳa, said of the moon, lit. “make itself come into view between two dark clouds”, said of the sun, “make part of it appear from behind clouds”: Ra'i says:

«...ka-ḳarni ('a)š šamsi 'aftaḳa ʔumma zāla» (LA).

1) The trilateral [ftḳ] is definitely from [fḳ] as in Egyp. fḳ' “to pull off, to cut” (EHD I, 262), Eth.: Ge. fḳ' “to break”, CA faḳa'a “to gouge out (an eye), rip open”, faḳḳa s.t. = farraḡa s.t. and CVII 'infāḳḳa = 'infaraḡa, i.e. cleave or separate s.t. in order to bring it to view or make it manifest”; hence faḳaḳa “to open”, but only in the sense ‘become visible wholly or partly when what is covering, enveloping, or surrounding its parts is drawn apart or allows for an opening’.

1a) The root [faḡ], too, expresses the same meaning in CA, and it lies beneath [frḡ]: Egyp. pg' “to open, divide, spread out” (EHD I, 252), Cush.: Saho, Afar fak “to open”, Hadiya fooḳḳ id., Bed., Agaw, Bil. fakak id., Ga. bakaka “split” (VPHS, p. 168, n. 362), etc.

1b) As one should expect, [pak], too, expresses the same meaning: CA fakka “to separate, open”, Egyp. pk “to separate, spread out”.

2) The original compound lying beneath [fḳ], [ftḳ], etc. is {\*fa' + \*-ḳ-/-g-}, which has been preserved in CA CV tafa''aḳa of [f'ḳ], said of anything = CV tafarrḡa, i.e. emerge or become visible in the sense just stated above and as in the PIP of Ru'bah:

«...’aw fakku ḡinway ḳatbin tafa''aḳa».

It is to be noted that ta-farraḡa also expresses an identical meaning; farīḡu “anything that is apparent + prominent + uncovered or open to view”. In MSA and modern dialects farraḡa also signifies “to show”; CV tafarraḡa “to watch, i.e. *make oneself see*”: CA CV expresses “uncover, bring to view” as in the PIP of Khansa:

«ḡattā tafarraḡati ('a)l 'ālāfu 'an raḡulin

mādin 'ālā ('a)l hauli ḡaira miḡyāri» (DKh, p. 60, L. 4).

3) The roots discussed so far are impossible to be from \*pat- (see *Comments II* in §3.8.17 above) as in JArām., Syr., Mand. ptt, BHeb. pātāt “break in pieces, tear off”, CA fatta “break in pieces”, Eth. ptt “to break bread” = CA futātu “broken pieces of bread” (MD, 385; OT, 877). The /-t/ is either a proot or grammatical element added to \*pa'-, whereas the /-t-/ of the doubled [ptt] is by progressive assimilation from an orig. /-ʔ-/. PHS \*pa'- is seen in CA fa'ā = to split, separate, cleave, in order to uncover, bring to view, show, open; CVII 'infā'ā = CVII 'infaraḡa, 'inkašafa above; 'infīyā'u = 'iftitāḡu [ftḡ], i.e. ‘opening’: BHeb. p' “to split”, Chad.: Bol poyy- “to break into pieces”, Mofu puw- “to split, tear into pieces” (HSED, n. 1912).

Like any other proot, \*pa'- can co-occur with permissible affixes, hence Egyp. wpy “to open”, Chad.: Dwot wup id. (HSED, n. 2553).

4) It appears quite evident that gen. HS trilateral [ptḡ] “to open” is a compound of three proots [pa'] “open”, -t-, and -ḡ “spread”.

**2.8.19** CA satala, sātala, said of people, “to come one after another in a stealthy manner”; mastalu “narrow path” < CA [r. sl]: CVII 'insalla “to steal into (as in try *to steal into the room*), slink, sneak, slip, be secretive”; 'insilālu “moving amid a crowd or in a narrow path”; CV yatasallaluna, as in the Koan: (يَتَسَلَّلُونَ مِنْكُمْ لَوَاذًا), *those who sneak one hiding by another* (24:63: LA): PHS stem [šal] “to plunder, steal, carry off” as in



Akk. *šalālu* “to plunder, carry off”; *šalla-tu* “plunder, spoils, booty” (AG, 101-102), BHeb. *šālāl* “to plunder, strip off, spoil; booty, plunder, spoil” (OT, 1063), CA *salla* “to steal, rub, plunder, pull out”, Sab. *s<sup>3</sup>llw* “to plunder”; *hs<sup>3</sup>ln* “sack a town” (SD, 138) = CA *našala* “take away” > MSA *našala* “to pick off”; *naššālu* “pickpocket”.

To PHS [šal] certainly belongs BHeb. *šālā(h)* “to draw out, take away”, CA *salā* occurs in a special context “to draw out, take away”, *salata* [slt] “draw out (e.g. intestines), seize”, SL *salat* “draw out s.t from its (natural) place, e.g. *hair, a visible part*, like *the ear*, etc., hence it can express to steal, plunder, take away”, Eth. *slt* “cut hair”, etc. (see §2.1.10, n. 5, last paragraph).

**2.8.20** Arabic trilateral [ntġ] is very interesting in that it has undergone a marked semantic change in the course of time. In MSA and all dialects *nataġa* = “to result”, CIV “to yield, produce”; *natīġa-tu* “result, product, outcome, consequence, conclusion”; CX *’istantaġa* “to conclude, infer”, and so on.

However, the basic meaning of [ntġ] in CA centers round “to beget, give birth to; be born; pregnant”, and such notions are restricted to *domestic animals*.

CA *nataġa*, CIV *’antaġa* “give birth”; *natūġu* “pregnant”; *nitāġu* pl. “offspring of domestic animals, young of cattle”, and so forth. One interesting derivative of the root is the word *natā’iġu* pl. = of the same age (but in all modern Arabic forms = “results” above); *natīġa-tu* expresses “same age” as in the following example: *These two sheep are natīġa-h* “of the same age” (but in modern Arabic “result, outcome, etc.” above). It seems that \*-t- in such words is the same as that of *tirbatu*, pl. *’atrābu* in §2.7.24 above, and that the remaining portion of the root, i.e. \*naġ-, is etymologically identical with [\*nag-] of *naġaba*, said of a female human being, “to give birth” and to *naġlu* masc. “son, offspring” with no verbal form or any other derivative, etc. It is evident to me that \*n- in these words is a proot, and appears to be identical with \*n- in *naslu* (§2.11.35 below) and in *naš’u* (see §2.11.66 below), but I do not know its exact meaning; it could be a term for either “descendant, birth, belonging to, or small”. It is also the very same [\*n-] of [nsb] as in CX *’ista-nsaba* “to trace a person’s genealogy”; *nāsaba* “be related to by marriage”; *nasabu* “genealogy, blood relationship; kin”, etc. The proot underlying [ntġ] could be \*gaW- “be, bring into being”<sup>116</sup> as in CA *ġā’a* “to become” also “to come”; CIV *’aġā’a* “to bring” (LA), Berb.: B.Sn. *uġ* “être (il était)”, Cush.: Ag., Bil. *ag*, De. *ag*, Ch. *aġ*, Qu. *ag*, a “devenir, arriver (être)” (VPHS, 82, n. 28), Oromo *gaya-* “arrive”, Afar *gay-* id. (HSED, n. 910). For another etymologically different [ngb], see §2.11.47 below.

**2.8.21** Sab. *’tm* “to bring together, reconcile two parties”; caus. *h’tm* “to join a thing to another”; *t’tm* “be regrouped”; *tmt* “pact, agreement” (SD, 8), Soq. *’etom* “rassembler, réunir”; *’itim* “compagnon”, CA *ma-’tamu* “réunion funèbre de femmes”. Rhodokanakis (in DRS I, 36) «*propose de considérer l’ar. (CA) ma’tam- comme un empr. à un dialecte sar. (SA), étant donné la rareté de la valeur “réunir” pour la rac. en ar.*».

The study of CA *ma’tamu* reveals, however, that its original signification is,

<sup>116</sup> Another good possibility is that [gaw] is a term for “cow”.

according to Farāhīdī (Al 'Ayn VIII, 141), «*a group of men and women getting together on a happy or unhappy occasion*». As a matter of fact, the definition reflects the meaning of the noun in pre-Islamic and early Islamic literature. LA (r. 'tm) gives a similar definition: «*gathering of people (men and woman) on happy or unhappy occasions*», and adds: «*Later, its meaning has become restricted to funeral meeting attended by women*». As for the underlying notion from which the word is derived, Bin Faris (ML I, 47) sees that «[tm] indicates the 'joining of one thing to another' and so does LA. In MSA and all dialects *ma'tam* expresses only "funeral gathering".

Ibin Durayd (Jamharh II, 1032) adopts Farāhīdī's definition and rightly derives [tm] and [t'm] "twin" (see §2.17.26 below) from the same root, thus CIV 'at'ama, said only of a woman, "to give birth to a twin".

For what concerns Rhodokanakis' view on the word and its etymology, it does not surprises me at all for one simple thing: *all of those- excluding no one- who have expressed views on the origin of any CA word have two conspicuous weaknesses in common: (a) they have completely overlooked the etymology of the word and thus definitely chosen the very wrong subject to make conjectures on, and (b) their views do not reflect sufficient knowledge of the language to qualify them to pronounce judgments on its words.* For further detail on this issue, see §3.25 below.

As for the trilateral [tm], it is from \*am- as in CA 'ummu, defined by Ibin Durayd (Jamharh I, 60) "anything joined to it other things", hence, 'ummu ('a)n-nuġum lit. "the mother of all stars", that is "galaxy; the Milky Way", so called because «*it is an assembly of such stars or it gathers together the stars*». The notion 'things joined together to form something' is preserved in all Semitic languages by the term 'umma-tu fem. "nation" as in BHeb., BAram. 'ummā "nation, race", Syr. 'umtā id., CA 'umma-tu ~ 'ummu id., Assyr. ummā-nu "tribe, people".

In going back to Sab. *t'tm* above, the equivalent term we use to express the very same idea is CVIII 'ilta'ma [r. l'm] "be reunited (members of a family)" (as in 'ilta'ama ('a)š šamlu id.), said of a wound, "to heal" (i.e. *the flesh be reunited as it was before the wound takes place*).

**2.8.22** CA nata'a [r. nt'] "to raise, jut out, bulge out, swell, be prominent"; nāti'u "salient, prominent"; nat'a-tu fem. "hillock", nata-tu "I looked at (e.g. *people, something*, etc.)", natā [r. nty] "to swell". Both trilaterals are definitely from a stem \*naw- CA nā'a expresses, according to one account, "to rise", and to another, (said of a star) "to rise and be apparent as another star falls and disappears". As for the notion "to see", It will be dealt with in the course of our discussion.

1) The basic meaning of [nw'] is "to rise + come into view or be apparent" as in nā'a id, BHeb. [nwh] "something eminent, ornamental, splendid". Gesenius (OT, 656) connects the word with CA [nwh]. There is no deep semantic difference between [nw'] and [nwh] as we will see below. CX 'istan'ā expresses "to look, see", the noun traditionally derived from this stem by means of /mu-/ is mustanā'u, which denotes "one who is asked for giving or is expected to give" as in the Poet. of Ibin 'ahmar:

«... wa ('a)l *mustanā'u* 'iḏā mā yaḫḫaṭu ('a)l maṭaru» (LA).

This is from naw'u "offering, gift": Cush.: Beja nuw "to offer, present to" (RPAA, n.

649). The following observations should be noted:

2) Sab. *nwy* “to separate oneself from s.o.” (SD, 101) = CA *na’ā* (bi *nafsihi* ‘an) id. (bi “by, with”, *nafsihi* “himself”, ‘an “away from”), orig. “make oneself far from”: *na’ā* “be far from”, derived, according to Ašma’i (MA, 384) from a quadriliteral [n’wy ?] = Egyp. *níw* “turn away from”, which is clearly a compound (see below).

In Egyp., however, the very same idea is also expressed by [w] “remote, afar”; w’í “to be away from a person or place; be remote, far off, to go away” (EHD I, 144) = CA *na’y* ~ *nawā* “the state of being far away, remote; remoteness”. Also comp. HEgy. w’-t “way, road, journey”; w’íw “travelers, remote (of countries); *yri w’-t* “to travel, to journey”, lit. make + journey (EHD I, 65) = CA ‘a-*nwā* “to travel to excess”; *nawiyu* “road-mate”, Egyp. w’ “to be about to do something” = CA *nawā* “to have in mind, to intend”; *nāwī* “one who is about or has already decided to move to another place or change place” (AL ‘Ayn VIII, 393-394, LA). There seems to be a PHS \*wai- “far > go far, travel, go away” and is also seen in Cush.: Kaf. *waa* “to come”, Anf. *Bwo waa*, Gim *wo*, Chad.: Fyer *wu* “go away”, Montol, Bokkos *wa id.*, Angas *wē* “return”, Dera, Tangale, *wa* “to come”, Mbara *wo id.* (HSED, n. 2489). To this proot n- is added, hence Egyp. *nwy* “to return (to), come (to)” (RPAA, n. 649). This Egyp. [n] seems to be a prep. and is linguistically identical with CA [na] in *nāša* (see §2.17.68 below).

3) On the other hand, Egyp. w’ “to attack, destroy”; w’w’ “to attack, go against” = CA *nāwa’a* “to oppose, resist, be against”, Assy. *nē’u* “to restrain, hinder” (King, 1898: 365), Heb. Hiph. נִדָּן “to deny, refuse, hinder” (OT, 655), and Egyp. w’w’ “flat field” = CA *wa’iy-* “wide, large”, said of a vessel, “flat and large”.

3) Egyp. *n’-t mw* denotes “water channel”, with n’-t “channel” and *mw* “water” = CA *nu’ā* ~ *nu’aw* ~ *nu’y* “channel made round the tent to prevent water from entering into it”, Sab. *nwy* “ditch” (SD, 101), and so forth.

4) BHeb. *nā’ā(h)* with prep. *lē* “to be proper, suitable, becoming to any one”; *nā’weh* adj. “becoming, suitable, proper” ~ *nāwā* [r. *nwh*] “to be decorous, becoming”; *nāweh* “becoming” also “inhabiting, dwelling” (OT, 656), Mand. *naia* “beautiful, pleasing, pleasant, becoming” (MD, 283). The BHeb. trilateral [n’h] appears to be *Niph.* of the verb ‘āwā(h) “be desired” and hence “be agreeable, decorous” (see OT, 637) = CA *nawā*, said of anything, “to endeavor to attain or reach”. All are from PHS \*W(‘) as in BHeb. *yā’ā(h)* “to be comely, becoming”, with prep. *lē* “it is becoming, suitable for any one” (OT, 370), CA *arch.* *wa’iya-tu* fem., said of a woman, “efficient or suitable and knowing how to take a good care of her home (of herself, etc.)”; imper. *ya-’ī*.

5) In CA and other Semitic languages as well as in Egyp. [nwy] expresses “to dwell, dwelling” as in BHeb. *nwh* “to sit; dwelling home” ~ n’h “to dwell”; נִיָּה pl. “dwelling”. Both Heb. triliterals also express “be decorous, becoming” (OT, 637, 656), also *Hiph.* of [nwh] “to decorate with praises” = CA *nauwaha* “to elevate with praises”; *nāha* “to elevate, to rise” (ŠHH VI, 2054), OffAram. *nwh* “dwelling” (NWSI II, 721) = CA *nawā* “dwelling home” also “turn into another home, place”, Sab. *nwy* “around, in the vicinity of”, Palm. *nwyt* “next to, together with” (NWSI II, 722), Egyp. n’í-t “house, abode” ~ ní-t pl. “a house, abode, chamber”: *nw-t* ~ *níwt* “village, town” (EHD I, 342, 348, 350; EG, 572). The notion “dwelling” is preserved in SL in this expression «ba’íd n-*nawā*», far (is) his dwelling home, *metaph.* out of sight = MSA and other dialects, including SL,

«ba'īd d-dār» (d- and n-, are by assimilation from /'l/ “the”, ba'īd = “far”, and dār = “house”).

6) BHeb. nwf “to lift up, elevate” (OT, 659) also EHeb. “to handle” (NWSI II, 723), CA nāfa “to be high and overlooking, be lofty” also “to surpass, be above”; nawfu “eminence, prominence”; niyfu, naiyifu, nīfatu (from niyfatu) “addition, increase (of anything)”, Akk. nūptu “additional payment, present” (NWSI II, 723), Sab. nwf “to bestow s.th. on s.o.” (SD, 101), etc. all are from a compound of stems [na-] + [wap] whose 2<sup>nd</sup> part expresses “be above, rise, etc.” as in Poet.

'awfā 'alā šarafi ('a)l ḡidāri bi sudfatin

7) BHeb. nwh something eminent, etc. above = CA nāha [r. nwh] “be lofty, be high, elevated; eminent”; CII nauwaha “to elevate, lift up, make famous, make eminent” (ṢHH VI, 2254; LA).

8) CA CX 'istan'a “to look, see” above strongly suggests the former presence of a proot \*n- in CA denoting this notion: cf. Eyp. nw' ~ n'w ~ nw “to see, to look” (EG, 573; EHD I, 344, 352) = Eth. na “siehe”, Chad.: Sura nāa “sehen”, etc. (Müller, 1975: 70, n. 83): PChad. \*n- “to see” as in Sura naa, Gera, Gerumm nee, Angas ne, Tera na, Wargla nah id., Berb.: Izayan anni “to see” (HSED, n. 1820; Carnochan, 1975: 465). SL and other dialects have preserved this root in CX 'ista-nna “to wait”: PHS stem \*na'- “see”.

It seems that the CA form is related to both CX 'istan'ā “to wait” and CX 'ista'nā id. (> SL 'istannā id. above). For the semantic relationship between “see” and “wait”: comp. CA CI naḡara “to see” and CVII 'intaḡara “to wait”.

9) CA nawlu “giving”; CII nauwala = 'a'ṡā = “to give, grant”; CIII nāwala “to hand to, to handle”; tanāwala “to take, receive”, i.e. *give to oneself*; nawlu “giving; bestowing, granting”; nāla “to obtain, acquire”, Tham. nl “être généreux, procurer” (Branden, 1950: 515).

Concerning the origin of [nwl], it is possible that this trilateral and [npl] are old variants. To my understanding, however, [nwl] is a compound of nau- “give or giving” (see (a) above) and \*-l- (?). Is /-l/ from 'alwu “a gift”? The root [ʿal-] is rarely used as vb. The form 'awlā (by shifting the radicals) is much more common “to give (attention, care), grant”; CX “to conquer” = Sab. 'wl “to get, obtain, bring back, get back” (SD, 10).

**2.8.23** BHeb. ktl “wall” from \*ktl “to encompass, surround”, BAram. kətal “wall”, CA katala “to enclose”; kutla-tu “a compact mass” (OT, 497), also CA mu-kattalu “compact and round or circular”; kutūlu pl. “overlooking top of a mountain”: PHS stem \*kal- as in Akk. kilīlu “wreath”, JAram. klyl “circle”, Hatra klyly “crown” (NWSI I, 512), CA 'iklīlu “any ornamental object put round the head (wreath, crown, and the like)” from kallala, takallala “to surround, round” (s.t. high, like the head, etc.); kilalu pl. “dome” (kalkalu “chest of camel, etc.” also “projected part of the chest”), Sab. klw “dam wall” (SD, 77). See §2.8.24 below.

The primary meaning of klīl in SL is *a small wreathlike-shape made of cloth or of anything (leaves, etc.) and used to protect the top of the head, where it is placed, from anything (wood, stack, jar of water, etc.) carried on it*. I don't see any deep semantic

difference between the signification of this word and that of žlāl (žlāl in all other dialects) “saddle” = CA ḡullu id., pl. ḡilālu. The basic meaning of [gl] in Sem. is also “circle, round, ball, etc.”, as in Mand. glala “something round, ball”, Syr. glālā “round”, Ge. ḡwəlləlāl “small dome (of church), etc. see §2.14.18 below. The term ḡull here, like -klāl above, suggests “s.t. (like cloth, etc.) placed or covering s.t. seen as high, so that the saddle is atop of s.t. high”, hence Jp. gullətā, Syr. gallā, “manteau”; gullātā “capuche”, SA: Meh. jilōl “couverture”, Ge. gəllā “voile” (DRS III, 125).

For BHeb., Aram., Sab. notion of “wall” above: cf. SL žallal CII “to surround a piece of land (in a slope, in a high place) with a wall”:

For CA kalkalu “chest” above: Ge. ḡwəle “poitrine, giron”, Tna ḡwəlä “sein” (DRS III ibid.)

**2.8.24** BHeb. ktr *Piel*. “to surround oneself”, *intrans.* “to crown oneself”, whence keter “diadem, crown” (OT, 498), Te. kätärä “to surround, make a hedge”, Amh. kättärä “make a dam”, Tna. mäktär “hedge”: Ge., Tna., W. kätärä “to prohibit, forbid”, from notion “surround”, Har. xätärä “to prohibit, forbid, prevent”; mäxtär “finger ring” (HED, 98, 106), CA katru “dome-shaped structure, hump”; kitra-tu fem. “dome” \*kar- (~ kal- in §3.8.23 above) as in BHeb. kārār “to move in a circle” (OT, 491), CA karkara, said of a mill-stone “to revolve, whirl round, turn round”; karkara-tu “making round, turning”; kirkira-tu “upper projected part of the chest (of beast of burden or she-camel)”, kura-tu fem. “global, spherical, ball”, etc. The same stem is seen in compounds as in §2.13.12.

**2.8.25** OAram. qtl “to kill” (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 6), Hatra., OffAram., JAram. qtl (\*qtl) id. (NWSI II, 1006), Syr. qṭāl, Eth. qatala “to kill” (Rabin, 1975: 88), CA qatala “to kill”, Sab. qtl id. (SD, 109): PHS stem \*qal- as in Cush. qal id., Ug., with caus. š- becoming part of the root, š-ql id. (UG, 533).

**2.8.26** CA rataḥa, said of dough or plaster, “soften” = CX ’istarhā in meaning (ṢHH I, 421). It is obvious that the signification of the verb is identical with that expressed by ’irtahā, CVIII of [rh]. All are from an adjective raḥāhu ~ raḥwu (see §3.1.6.4 above).

**2.8.27** Assy. natāku “to disappear, dissolve” (King, 1898: 372), CA ntḵ (rtḵ above) “to uproot, shake, tire out”, BHeb. nātaḵ “to tear away, pluck off, break” (OT, 706), OffAram. ntḵ “to take away, conquer”, DA ntḵ “to pull, draw” (NWSI, II, 771): PHS stem \*naḵ- “to destroy”, seen in almost all Semitic and Egyp. roots beginning with /nḵ-/. The following examples of trilaterals beginning with nḵ- are believed to antedate the appearance of [ntḵ].

1) nḵm: Akk., CA, Tham., Aram., BHeb., Sab. “to avenge”: Egyp. “to mourn, lament, grieve”;

2) nḵb: Akk. “to pierce” also “well, source”, BHeb. “bore a hole, to perforate, to destroy, pierce”, CA “to bore, perforate, excavate, pierce, dig”, Sab. “to excavate, cut”, Mand. “to make a hole, pierce”, Syr., BAram. “to bore a hole”;

3) nḵ’: CA CI. “to stagnate (water)”; CVIII. “to slaughter, kill”, BHeb. “to cut off”, Eth. “to tear”: Egyp. nḵ’ “to rub down”; nḵ’wt, pl., “foe crushed or beaten to death”;

4) nḵr: Akk. “to destroy, pull down”, CA “to bore through, dig into, bore out (the eye); hole, hollow, cavity; orbit (of the eye)”, BHeb. “to bore, pierce, bore out (the eye); be dug out”, Syr., BAram. “to bore, bore out (the eye)”, Sab. “strike force”, Aram. “to dig, pierce”, Mand. “to dig”;

5) nḵp: BHeb. “to strike, smite in pieces, cut down, move in a circle, encircle”, JAram. “to strike, bruise”, Mand. nḵp “to strike, push down, knock down”, CA “to break open, bore; smash”, Pun. “to cut (down)”, Eth. nḵf “to peel off”;

6) nḵš: Aram., Syr., BHeb. “to strike”, Man. “to torture”, CA “to strike (the bell), to inscribe, engrave”;

7) nḵl: Sab. “to excavate”, CA “to remove”, Har. “to pull out, uproot”, Te. “to pull out”, Ge., Tna. id.;

8) nḵḵ: CA “hollow-eye”, BHeb. nḵḵ “cleft in the rock”, Tna. nḵnḵā “to shake”, Te. nḵnḵā id., Amh. nḵännḵā “to agitate”;

9) nḵḡ: Sab. “loss, damage”, CA “to diminish, grow less, decline”;

10) nḵz: Sab. “to excavate”, CA “a kind of disease that kills sheep rapidly”;

The list of trilaterals cited above is incomplete and there are still some other etymologically different trilaterals beginning with [nḵ-], such as HS [nḵy] “pure, clean”. All such trilaterals are compounds of at least three proots \*na-, \*-ḵ-, and the last radical of each. They will be reexamined below at the right place and time.

**2.8.28** Akk. ḵutru “smoke”, Ug. ḵṯr “smoke”, Eth. ḵetārē “incense” (Rabin, 1975: 89), Aram., Sab. mḵṯr “incense-alter” (SD, 109) = CA miḵṯara-tu *inst.* id.; ḵuṯru, ḵuṯuru “odorous wood burned as perfume or incense”, Phoen. ḵṯr “to make smoke”, Pun. ḵṯrt “perfume” (NWSI II, 1007), BHeb. ḵāṯar “to smoke, burn incense; fragrant smoke, perfume, incense” (OT, 924), Egyp. ḵ’t’lty “incense”, Assyr. ḵu-ta-ru id. (HED II, 765): PHS stem [ḵar] as in Akk. ḵarāru “to burn” (VPHS, 127, n. 239), CA ḵarra, possibly signifies “to burn something”: cf. CVIII ’iḵtarra, said of a cooking pot, lit. “to cook in such a way that what is in the pot will burn and stick to the bottom of the pot”, Egyp. ḵrr “oven, furnace, fire” (EHD II, 775), Chad.: Karkare karu “to burn”, Mandara, Glavda kara “fire”, Mofu kakər “to burn” (HSED, n. 1553).

The most ancient causative form of [sa-ḵar] has been preserved intact in CA §3.2.46 above.

**2.8.29** BHeb. kptr “a crown”, analyzed by Gesenius as a compound of [kpr] “to cover” and [ktr] “to crown”. The word is a compound of prefixed /t-/, becoming- by metathesis- an infix in Heb., plus *kpr* “to cover”: cf. CA takfīr [kfr] “a crown” as in Poet.

«malikun yulāṯu bira’sihi *takfīru*» (LA).

**2.8.30** CA fatana “infatuate, seduce, captivate, fascinate”, Syr., Mand. ptn “to seduce, excite” (MD, 385): stem \*pan as in CA mi-fannu “miraculous”; CVIII ’iftanna “to fascinate (in speech) by speaking on various topics”; fannu “style, type, art” (LA); MSA fannānu “artist”. See §2.3.28 above.

**2.8.31** BHeb. rātaḵ “to bind, put in fetters”; pass. “be bound in fetters”; rətuḵōt fem. pl.

“chains”, Aram. ritkā “enclosure” (OT, 999-1000, Ryder, 1974: 117), CA rataḳa “to patch up, mend, stitch up, weld” as in the Koran: (ان السموات والأرض كانتا رتقا ففتقناهما), *the heavens and the earth were one piece* (i.e. a unified body or mass) and we cleft them asunder (21: 30). As one may notice from this verse, rataḳa is the oppsite of fataḳa = Egyp. fdḳ “to tear asunder” (EG, 567), etc. see §2.8.18 above. I have indeed seen this \*f-signifying in some trilaterals “apart, split” or “dis-”. An obvious example is CA waṣala “to join” vs faṣala “to disjoin”.

The above-mentioned cognates seem to be from a stem \*raḳ-, perh. one of its significations “to bind or fetter by reciting words of power (for the purpose of ‘protection’)” as in Egyp. rk’ “to work magic on someone” (EHD I, 434), CA raḳā “to recite words of power, work magic on someone”, Sab. rḳ-t “female magician” (SD, 117) = CA rāḳiya-tu id., OAram. rḳy, rḳḳ “to capture” (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 6), rḳy, id. (NWSI II, 1083f) = CA riḳḳu “slavery, bondage”; raḳīḳu pl. “bond-man, slave”: CIV ’araḳḳa is the exact antonym of CIV ’a’taḳa “to set free, as a slave” (in §2.8.31 below).

**2.8.32** Akk. etēḳu “to pass through, cross, remove” (AG, 74), Assy. etēḳu “to go (through or into), traverse, advance”; šūtiḳ caus. “to depart from, remove from”; mētiḳu “course” (King, 1898: 332), Ug. ’tḳ “to pass” (UG, 534), Chad.: Housa tuḳa “go away” (HSED, n. 1143), BHeb. ’tḳ “to take away, remove; set free” also “be advanced in years”, from this idea comes the signification “*be antique*”, and thus “*be venerable, noble, splendid*”, according to Gesenius (OT, 830), CA ’ataḳa “to set free a slave”; ’atuḳa “be advanced in years, aged” (~ ’ataḳa id. also “to wander”: cf. Al ’Ayn I, 195), hence ’atīḳu “*antique*” also “*splendid; beautiful, noble*”, OAram. ’tyḳ “old” (AG, 11), Palm., OffAram. ’tḳ id. (NWSI II, 898). It is possible that the trilateral has developed from \*’aḳ- “to go into or pass through” as in Egyp. ’ḳ “to go in, enter”, CA CVII ’in’aḳḳa, said only of lightning, “to pass through a cloud; sneak into” (Al ’Ayn I, 73).

#### Comments

1) Sem. [’tḳ] “old” is not a compound whose first element is based on [’ty]: [’y] in §3.8.3 above, but rather has developed from the root in CA ’āḳa “delay, retard; be delayed, detained”.

2) Notions like ‘go in(to)’ and ‘enter’ calls for ‘place (of residence), dwelling’. Accordingly, there seems to be a relation between \*’aḳ- above and CA ’aḳā-tu, ’aḳwa-tu “land surrounding or near a house or place where people live, settlement”.

3) To my understanding, a stem [’ḳ] underlies the trilateral [d’ḳ] as in CA da’aḳa “to flee, to send, to advance or precede” (ML II, 281, LA), where \*d- is caus. (§2.1.6.5 above)

**2.8.33** CA ḳutma-tu fem. “light (not heavy) darkness”; ḳātimu “red-gray”; ḳatama “be/become blackish” ~ ḳtn as in ḳātinu “dark, black”; ḳatūnu “a kind of ape, so-called because it has little blood”. Both [ḳtm] and [ḳtn] are certainly from two variant words \*ḳ’m ~ \*ḳ’n respectively, and ultimately from a proot \*ḳ’-. A proot [k’-] (see §2.9.11 below) and a proot \*gW- (see §2.15.21 below, esp. n. 5) also exists.

To the proot under discussion possibly belong CA [ḳn’] in ḳana’a “to become very

red”; *ḳāni*’u “red”, also [*ḳny*] in *ḳāni* “red”; *muḳānā*-tu “mixing colors”, hence in ‘weaving’ “black and white threads”, BAram., BHeb. *ḳn*’ “be jealous; jealousy”, from the redness or flush with which the face is suffused, according to Gesenius (OT, 929), Egyp. *ḳn*’ “a kind of ochre, colored earth” (EHD II, 773) also “yellow”, Proto-Southern Cush. *k’ân*- “yellow, tan, yellow grey” (RPAA, n. 657)<sup>117</sup>.

**2.8.34** CA *ḥatama* “to impose as duty or necessity”; *muḥattamu* “inevitable, unavoidable”; *ḥatman* adv. “decidedly, assuredly, inevitably, certainly” < *ḥumma*, CIV, *’uḥjima* “be incumbent upon, doomed”, perh. Egyp. *ḥm* “assuredly, indeed” (EG, §253).

**2.8.35** CA *’utiha* “be idiot”; *ma’tūhu* “idiot”; *’atāhiyatu* “idiocy” (Al *’Ayn* I, 104) < *’āha*-tu physical or mental defect”.

**2.8.36** CA *’ataba* “to find (something) *against* s.o” also “to blame s.o for”, Sab. *’tb* “destine to destruction” (SD, 22) < *’āba* “to find fault with or something against”, from *’aibu* “shame, disgrace”.

**2.8.37** CA *’ataka* “to attack, overcome, strike” < *’akka* “to subdue, beat”. The proot is also seen with prefixed *\*b-* in *ba’aka* “to strike or hit repeatedly” (for prefixed *b-*, see §2.13 below). SL *ma’ak* “to beat”, etc. see §2.10.24 below.

**2.8.38** CA, OYem. *hataša*, said of a dog “be provoked, so *it brays and attacks*” < SL *hāš*, *said only of a dog*, id.

**2.8.39** CA *bata’a* “to dwell”, *bataya* id.: *baw-* (see §2.9.22 below).

**2.8.40** Ug. *’tw* “to come” (UG, 531), CA *’atā* [*’tw/’ty*] “to come, bring, come back”, Sab. *’tw* “to come, to bring, come back” (SD, 9), BHeb. *’atā* “to come, to go, to bring”, BAram. *’ātā* “to come, to go” (OT, 103), OAram. *’th* “to come”, Palm. *’t*, Hatra *’ty*, JAram. *’th*, Pun. *’t* “to come, to go” (NWSI I, 133f): PHS [*’aw*] in Egyp. *yw* “to come”.

**2.8.41** Sab. *s²t’* “to arise, build up, occur” = CA *naša’a*, etc. see §3.11.66 below.

**2.8.42** CA *hatā* “to give”, *hāta* “to give” (also “bring, i.e. *give me, hand me, bring to me*)

<sup>117</sup> On the other hand, Egyp. *ḳnw* “a strong bull, stallion” (EHD II, 774), so-called perh. from its color or mixed colors, or from a different stem *\*ḳan-* = *ḳanā* pl. “a horse with a curved nose and of hybrid origin”, *ḳanā*-tu “wild cow” as in the PIP of Labid:

«wa *ḳanā*-tin tabyī biḥbata *’ahdan*  
min ḏabūḥin *ḳaffā* *’alaihi* (*’a*)l ḥabālu»

It is possible, however, that CA-Egyp. *ḳnw* “stallion” above is from *\*ḳnb* in CA *mi-ḳnabu* “30 to 40 or about 300 horses, group of horses and horsemen”.



whose initial /h-/ is, according to Farāhīdī (ṢḤḤ I, 271), from /ʔ-/ . We also have ʾātā “to give”; ʾatwu “giving”. Both triliterals includes infixed /-t-/ . The older form is arch. hāʾa “to give” also “to take” (LA, r. هـ, i.e. hā). Sem. /-d-/ of hadā [hdy] “to give a present” is variant of /-t-/ .

**2.8.43** CA rataka, said of she-camels, “to walk as if the legs are fettered while beating the ground with the hands”; ya-rtuku “it shakes while moving”: CVIII ya-rtaku [rk] “he shakes while moving”. To my understanding, rataka and ratağa are variants of [raġ] or [rak], hence one can say or write yartaġġu or yartakku “he shakes” (see §2.7.9 above).

**2.8.44** CA ɣutma-tu “inability to express oneself, incomprehensible utterance” is from ɣamɣama “speak obscurely”: ɣumma *pass.*, said of news, “be incomprehensible”.

## 2.9 PHS SUFFIXED /-t/

Suffixed /-t ~ -āt/ is a HS suffix used to express a variety of grammatical functions. The most important of such functions are:

1) It is added to some masculine singular nouns, esp. *those denoting family relationships*, to derive their corresponding feminine nouns, such as Akk., CA bintu “daughter”: Akk., CA binu “son”, Egyp. snt “sister”: sn “brother”, Housa kariata “bitch”: karia “dog”, Cush.: Ga. elō-t fem. “lover”: elo masc. “lover”, Bed. takat “woman”: tak “man”, Dembia gel-tī “female calf”: ger “bull calf”, Kemant yil-t “eye” as opposed to Dembia, Quara yi masc. “eye”, Xamir yel, el id<sup>118</sup>.

2) The suffix is also used to derive a feminine adjective from the corresponding masculine as in CA ʔawīlatu fem. “tall” from ʔawīlu, Eth. šādekt fem. “just” from šādeḳ, Cush.: Ga. soretti “rich (woman)” from sorēsa, dima-tu fem. “red” from masc. dimā. O’Leary (1969: §121) finds that

*«Assyrian and ancient Egyptian stand alone in adding the feminine aformative -t, -at to all names of females».*

Casellino (1975: 354) adds that Egyptian

*«uses the feminine not only for natural gender but also for abstract nouns, for collectives, neutral expression such as “what, that which”, for various nouns denoting objects, etc. and, finally, for names of foreign countries, cities...»*

It is important to note, however, that many nouns do not show the difference of gender by any ending; so that, the feminine noun and its corresponding masculine are from two different roots such as Akk., CA ’abu “father”; Akk., CA ’ummu “mother” (Egyp. add -t, hence mw-t id.); Akk. imēru, CA ʕimāru “ass”, Akk., CA ’atānu “she-ass” (Ug. adds -t, hence atnt id.), Cush.: Sid. laba “male”, mēa “female”; Bed. san “brother”, kwa “sister”. Moreover, there are many feminine nouns without any termination, such as CA ’arḏu, BHeb. ’ereṣ, Sab. ’rḏ fem. “earth” (Akk. attaches -t, hence ’erṣetu id.); CA nafsu, BHeb. nepeš, Sab. nfs fem. “soul” (Akk. adds -t, hence napištu id.), and many masculine nouns ending with /-t/, such as CA ’allāma-tu masc. “man of knowledge”, halīfa-tu masc. “Caliph”. Terms for parts of the body are classified as masculine or feminine without any termination, such as Akk. uznu, CA ’uḏnu fem. ear”, Akk. lišānu, CA lišānu

<sup>118</sup> Many Cushitic languages mark the feminine gender with a vowel like -ē, -ā, -ī, -iye, etc. as in Kaffa ūr-ē “woman” from ūrō “man”, Awiya agal-ā “mistress” from agal “master”, Bil. jikaw-ī fem. “heavy” from masc. jikaw “heavy”, etc. In modern Arabic dialects, too, such vowels are also used for the same purpose and have developed from CA pausal form /-h/ of PHS \*-t = BHeb. /-h/ above, e.g. CA namlatu “ant” > namlah (BHeb. nāmālāh) = modern Arabic dialect namlē; CA baḳarah “cow” > in modern dialects baḳarā; šabiyyah “young girl” > šabiyyē; ʕaḳīlah “heavy” > ʕḳīlī or ʕḳīlē, etc. Moreover, such vowels have also been extended by analogy to all other feminine endings, such as /-ā’u/: ʕasnā’u “beautiful” > ʕasnā, and to the feminine pronoun /-hā/ “her” as in CA baituhā “her house” > baitā, ’ilaihā ~ lahā “for her, to her” > ilā, ra’aituhā “I saw her” > ra’aitā.

masc. “tongue”. With the exceptions of some nouns, like binu “son”: bintu “daughter” above, the gender of a noun can be best known from the gender of modifying adjectives and demonstratives<sup>119</sup>.

3) Suffixed /-t/ is used to derive the name of the individual from the collective plural noun as in CA baqaratu fem. “a cow” from baqaru “cows”<sup>120</sup>, namalatu, fem. “an ant”: namlu “ants”, ša’ratu, BHeb. ša’arah “a single hair”: CA ša’ru, BHeb. šē’ar “hair”, BHeb. ’ebrāh “pinion” from ’ēber “pinions”, Eth. lūlāt a single “pearl” from the coll. lūl = CA lu’lu’atu from lu’lu’u id. (modern dialects lūlū), etc., Cush.: Afar lūbak “lion, as a class”, pl. lūbuk “lions”, a single lioness of the class is indicated by a suffix /-tō/: lūbāk-tō, and a single lion by a suffix -to: lūbāk-to.

4) Suffixed /-t/ is employed to mark the plural of a feminine noun as in Heb. ’ātōnōt “she-asses”: fem. ’ātōn; Akk. harrānātu fem. “roads”: fem. harrānu.

It is also used to form the plural of a masculine noun, esp. *of occupation or trade*, as in Akk. ikkārātu “peasants”: ikkāru, CA wulātu “governors”: wālī “governor”, ru’ātu pl. of rā’ī “shepherd”, qūdātu pl. of qādī “judge”<sup>121</sup>.

5) Suffixed /-t/ is employed to derive abstract nouns from verbs and adjectives as in Akk. dalāhu “to disturb, confuse”: dalihtu “disturbance”, CA wasāmatu, Ug. ysmt “beauty”: CA wasīmu “handsome; beautiful”, Ug. ysm “beautiful”, Sab. ’zt “strength”, CA ’izza-tu “glory, strength”, BHeb. nāqāmāh, CA niqma-tu “vengeance”, etc., Eyp. dpt “taste”: dp “to taste”, Cush.: Afar amanā-t “protection”: amana “to defend”.

The number of triliterals ending with \*-t in HS is so small to the extent that it makes any analyst suspicious about it. There are two basic sources for this morpheme: (a) infixed /-t-/ becoming a suffix by metathesis and (b) suffixed /-t/ in (4) above. There is no denying that \*-t could also be a proot expressing “make, cause”.

#### Comments

a) My view on -t as a *fem. pl. ending* in CA differs from that of all old Arab scholars and all Semitists. The view is that /-t/ is not a *fem. pl. ending at all*, and that plurality is indicated by a long /-ā-/ placed before the fem. marker /-t/ as in (nouns): bint “daughter” > pl. banāt, mu’minatu “believer” > pl. mu’minātu; (adjectives): ḡamilatu > pl. ḡamilātu,

<sup>119</sup> In many cases, however, the gender of the adjective is what we may call ‘*common gender*’, which can also be known in CA from the *natural gender* of the noun it modifies or the gender of the demonstrative, e.g. ragulun ‘aḡūzu “aged man” vs ‘imara’atun ‘aḡūzu “aged woman”.

‘*Internal vowel change*’ may also be used in some cases to distinguish gender in CA as in ‘arīsu “bridegroom”, fem. ‘arūsu.

<sup>120</sup> Suffixed -t (or -h in pause) is considered by Ibin Sidihi as signifying “one of a species”. The pl. of coll. baqaru is ‘abquru.

<sup>121</sup> Some examples of analogical creations are riḡālātu masc. pl. “men, in the sense limited numbers of men, i.e. *the best and most distinguished of a given tribe or social group* (in MSA ‘those who hold the highest positions in a state’): riḡālu pl. “men”: sg. raḡulu, ḡamāmātu fem. pl. “limited numbers of pigeons”: coll. ḡamāmu: sg. ḡamāma-tu. Azhari (ṢHH II, 676, r. sbṭr) distinguished this /-t/ from the fem. pl. ending /-t/. In fact, the gender of this /-t/ depends on the gender of the plural noun to which is attached, but it owes its existence to analogy with nouns, esp. fem. nouns, forming their plurals with /-t/.

ṭawilatu “tall” > pl. ṭawilātu. Even in some masculine nouns ending with /-t/ like ḥalīfatu “Caliph”, the plural ḥulafā’u is indicated by /-ā-/. The same holds true for feminine nouns like ’uḥtu “sister” > pl. ’aḥawātu. As one may notice, the whole function of /-t/ here is to derive a fem. noun from the corresponding masc. ’aḥu “brother”, and not to indicate plurality.

One can see an infix /-w-/ in ’aḥawātu above and may wonder about its origin. As has already been mentioned (§2.1.3 above), old Arab scholars consider biradical nouns like ’aḥu “brothers” and ’abu “father” as the product of linguistic decay; both have been developed from roots [’hw] and [’bw] respectively. They argue that the lost final radical, i.e. /w/, is still seen in the dual forms ’aḥawāni “two brothers” and ’abawāni “father & mother” and in the plurals ’uḥwatu ~ ’ihwānu “brothers” and ’ābā’u, signifying here “forefathers, ancestors” (archaic variants ’abū-n, i.e. ’bw-n ~ ’ubuwwu: cf. LA). My view on this issue is that /-w/ is originally a plural marker, and that a plural like ’abū-n is from \*’abuwu-n, while ’ubuwwu could be a double plural consisting of pl. \*’abub (see *plurals formed by repeating the last radicals* in §2.1.14.4, n. 3, under *Comments* above) + a plural marker /-w/. The first vowel /-u-/ may be due to vowel harmony.

As a matter of fact, I have no evidence to support the view that /-w/ is a plural ending other than the above-mentioned archaic forms, and that /-w/ is used as a plural marker in some parts of speech like the verb as in perf.: katab “he wrote” > katabū “they wrote”; imperf.: yaktub “he writes” > yaktubū-n “they write”, etc. (see §2.4.5, ft. 1 above); in both examples /-ū/ stands for an underlying /-w/. The fact that /-w/ is used as a plural ending in Egypt. strongly supports my view. Consider the following:

Egypt. sn “brother” > snw “brothers”

Egypt. snt “sister” > snwt “sisters”

Since Egypt. and CA are very closely related languages, CA endings /-wt/ in ’ḥ-wt “sisters” above *must* be linguistically identical with Egypt. /-wt/ in sn-wt above. This would make CA /-ā-/ from an orig. /-w-/. In accordance with this *inescapable* conclusion, CA and Sem. katabū “they masc. wrote” is from \*katabuw, a compound consisting of at least *four* proots *agglutinated* together. The loss of /w or y/ causes a compensatory lengthening: comp. \*ḥawafa [ḥwf] “fear” > ḥāfa, \*ṭayara [ṭyr] “fly” > ṭāra, \*daraya [dry] “know” > darā, etc. a rule admitting no exceptions.

There is still another arch. pl. form of ’abu “father” cited by Laḥyāni (LA) which is ’ubuwwatu with a *strange signification* “forefathers, ancestors”. The -t of ’ubuwwatu is linguistically identical with that of ’umūmatu fem. “motherhood” and ’uḥuwwatu fem. “brotherhood”, and it is ‘*only syntactically*’ a feminine noun, but semantically masculine. The demonstrative used with all such nouns is fem. ḥāḍihi and *not* masc. ḥāḍā. The actual meaning of ’ubuwwatu throughout the history of the language is “fatherhood” and never “forefathers” as Laḥyāni *wrongly claimed*. The last pl. form found in the language is ’abawātu (the same stem as that of ’aḥawātu “sisters”) = Egypt. ’bwt “forefathers” < ’b “father”.

b) The pl. form of ’ummu “mother” shows an *unetymological* /-h-/ inserted before the pl. marker /-ā-/: ’ummahātu. Old Arab scholars seized this phenomenon to claim that the word is from a root [’mh]. There is no linguistic evidence supporting the earlier presence of /-h-/ in the root. The /-h-/ could possibly be from the fem. suffix -t, which is

pronounced only in ‘*pause*’ as /-h/, but in some other Semitic language (e.g. Heb. as /-h/ in nearly all words). Regardless of the origin of /-h-/, the infix performs a *vital function* in CA in that it differentiates between the pl. form of ‘*mother of a human being*’ above and ‘*mother of an animal*’, i.e. ‘*ummātu*’. This important function may rule out an earlier underlying /-t-/. This /-h-/ has perh. nothing to do with Egyp. hw “relatives, household; progeny; seed”, and is seen in very few additional words like *sana-tu*, the most common Hamito-Semitic term for “year”; its pl. in CA may be *sanahā-tu* ~ *sanawā-tu* also *sinī-na* ~ *sinū-nu*. Some old Arab scholars traced *sana-tu* to *sanha-tu* and some others to *sanwa-tu*. An arch. and earlier signification of CA *sana-tu* is ‘*droughty year*’ (Koran 7: 130) and it is seen in compounds (see §2.17.65 below).

c) My final comment is on a Sem. -t ending, seen in CA when *calling one’s father* (vocative case ?): *yā ’abati* as in the Koran: (يَا أَبَتِ), *O, my father ...* (12: 4). It is also seen in ‘*abatāh*’, which is used in *calling* or in *lamenting one’s father*. Aside from these two forms, I have not seen this /-t/ in any word form in the language. The very same /-t/ is found in some other Semitic languages as in Phoen. ‘bt, but wrongly considered as signifying “father’s power, status of a father” (NWSI I, 8). Old Arab scholars consider this /-t/ as a substitute for /y/. We reject this view on the basis of the same argument they had used to establish it. If /-t/ is used instead of /-y/, then we should see it in some other similar words like, for example, ‘āhu “brother” and šihru “son-in-law”. Since one cannot say \*’āhati and \*šihrati, the view should be utterly rejected. It is possible that the proot comes from an ancient term [’at] for a sort of ‘*father*’, perh. ‘*master or lord used in the sense of father*’. I will come back to this word later.

**2.9.1** Akk. *kupputu* “to come together”<sup>122</sup>, Mand. *kpt* “to tie, bind, fetter” (MD, 222), BAram. *kpt* “to bind, fetter” (OT, 486), CA *kaffata* “to collect and bind, bring together, to join” as in the PIP of Zuhair bin Abi Slama:

«wa mufādatin, ka(’a)n nahyi tansuġuhu (’a)š šibā  
baidā’a, kuffita faḍluhā bimuhannadi» (LA).

The origin of this trilateral lies in a stem [kap] “palm of the hand” as in CA *kappa* “to gather a thing and hold it”; in *Hadith*: «*nuhīna ’an na-kfita ’aθ θiyāba fī ’aš šalāti*», i.e. *bring one’s clothes together and hold them with the hands*”: see §2.8.9 below.

**2.9.2** Assy. *lapātu* “to turn, overturn, destroy” (King, 1898: 358), BHeb. *lāpat* “to bend, turn, fold”; *Niph.* “to bend oneself, turn oneself back or round, turn aside from a way” (OT, 525), CA *lafata* “to turn away the face, bend”; CV *talaffata* “to look back by turning the head; CVIII ‘*ilafata* “to turn oneself to any one”. The trilateral is a compound of \*lap- and \*-t-. The first element expresses “to turn, fold” as in CA *laffa* “to turn, fold, wrap round”; CIV ‘*alaffa* “to wrap up, fold”; CVIII ‘*iltaffa* “to wrap round, fold, twist”, Cush. \*lef “to wrap” (RPAA, n. 812).

1) Farāhīdi (Al ‘Ayn VIII, 121) does not see any difference in meaning between *laftu* and *fatlu*. The difference in meaning between these two forms is slight in SL; the former expresses “turn round, twist round, to spin” (also CA *fatala* id.), while the latter is

<sup>122</sup> The Akk. word finds its closest cognate *only in SL* as in CVI *t-kēfatū* “they came together or in groups” ‘*laynā* (on us) *n-nās* (the people) “people came to us together or in groups”.

semantically much closer to *baram* than to *lafat*. As an illustration, one can use *baram* with ‘a screw’ (*fatal* may be used here, but never *lafat*) and *fatal* or *baram* with ‘threads’ in order to make a rope, cord, etc.

2) The trilateral [ptl] is also seen in other HS languages as in BHeb. pātal "to twist"; *Niph.* "be twisted"; pātīl "a thread, line, cord", CA fatīlu "wick, cord, thread", BAram., Syr. ptl "to twist, to spin, twine" (OT, 876), Har. (a)fātāla "spin", fatli "thread", Ge., Tna., S., W., Z. fātālā "to twist, spin", Te. fātal, Amh., Ms., Go. fättälä (m), Arg. fättäla id. With -l > -t: Har. fātīt "cord, rope", Z., South Arg. fatita, Cush.: Ga. fatita (HED, 65).

3) The basic stem underlying all trilaterals cited above and so many others is \*’ap- as in Akk. apapu “lier, entourer”, BHeb. ’āpap “to surround, encompass” (OT, 79; DRS I, 29). The proot is also seen in Egyp. ntf “to untie”, a compound of neg. n-, reflex. -t-, and \*’ap; this without the neg. element = Chad.: Sha, Kulere top “to tie up”, Sura teep “to plait”, Chip tēp-ka id., Gisiga tof “to sew”, Mofu tēf “to tie, sew” (HSED, n. 2409).

**2.9.3** BHeb. ’āwat "to be crooked, curved"; *Hithp.* "to bend oneself, to bow down", in Syr. "to deceive, fraud", etc. (OT, 763; also see NWSI II, 896): PHS stem [’aw] (see §2.17.2 below, ft. <sup>1</sup>).

**2.9.4** CA [slt] in CVII ’insalata “to sneak, steal into, move stealthily” = [sll] in CVII ’insalla id.; salata “to cut off with a sword” = salla “to draw out a sword from its sheath”; salata “to peel, pare” = [sl] in maslu, maslūlu “lacking bark, shell, husk” (see §§2.11.36 and 2.17.76 below).

**2.9.5** BHeb. ḥmt obsol. root: CA ḥamtu “hot”; ḥamuta “be warm, hot”, etc. (OT, 327): CA, BHeb. and gen. HS [ḥam] “heat, hot”. To this stem also belongs CA [mḥt] in maḥtu “very hot” (see §2.2.6 above).

**2.9.6** Among other trilaterals based on [ḥam] is [ḥmd] as in CA ḥamida “become angry”; *muḥtamidu* “very hot”, like *ḥamtu* (in §2.9.5 above) and *muḥtadimu* [ḥdm]<sup>123</sup>; ḥamda-ta, said of fire, “the noises it makes when it is flamed up” = Ge., Tna., Te. ḥamād “ashes”, Har. ḥamād id.; ḥamādām “who looks angry”, Amh., E., M., Go., A., Gt. hamād “ashes” (HED, 83).

**2.9.7** Ge. dabata “se plier, marcher courbé” (DRS III), Amh. dābātā “tomber sans connaissance”: CA dabba as in *ya-dubbu* (he walks hunch-backed) ’alā (on) ’aṣā-h (= stick-his), *he walks with hunched back leaning on his stick*, SL dabb id. also “make fall on the ground”. If we want to intensify the sense of ‘falling’ in the sense that *it can be heard from a distance*, we say *daba’*.

The basic meaning of [dab], however, is “walk in slow and heavy steps”, and the root for “hunch-back” is [ḥdb] as in CA ’aḥdabu id. as a vb ḥadaba. An infix /-r-/ between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> syllables ḥardab is found in most modern dialects.

<sup>123</sup> CA ḥadmu “heating s.t. (by the sun or fire) to the extreme”: ḥadamah or ḥamadah “fire”.

**2.9.8** CA 'altu [ʾlt] "oath" as a vb 'alata (MA, 28; LA): 'illu "oath, covenant", BHeb. 'ālā "an oath, an oath of covenant". The proot is also seen in compounds as in §2.13.14 below.

On the other hand, CA 'ulta-tu [ʾlt] "a gift" is from 'alwu id.

**2.9.9** CA ḥlt "to shave the head" also "to pluck out (the hair)" = CA [ḥl'] id<sup>124</sup>.

**2.9.10** CA ḥafata lit. "make the voice low, i.e. *make faint, drop into silence*" as in the Koran (17: 110) = haffafa [hf] id.

**2.9.11** CA [kmt] "red" also "red-black", and, according to Farāhīdi, "a mixture of red and black colors" (Al 'Ayn V, 343). LA (r. škr), however, states that «*when a red ocher becomes black, it is called kumaitu*» ~ [ktm], according to Azhari, "reddish plant from whose leaves *henna* is obtained", but to some others, "a mixture colored black" (LA). Its Egyp. cognate is k'm "black, dark" (EHD II, 787), Mand. akam "become black, get black" (MD, 17).

It is interesting to note that CA *kumaitu* is also a term for "wine" = Egyp. k'm "wine" (EHD *ibid.*): see §2.8.32 above.

**2.9.12** CIII lāta, CIV 'alāta "to stop s.o. and make him turn away from (his intended destination)" is from lawā "to turn, twist".

Another trilateral lāta "becomes vague, unclear"; imperf. yalītu, but the adverbial form laiy-an (MA, 366) tells that the origin lies in laiy "twisting" above.

**2.9.13** The final -t in the Sab trilateral [wšt] "to ordain, decree" is obviously a suffix forming nouns, usually *fem.*, from verbs, and is identical with CA waṣiya-tu *fem.* "a will, decree": waṣṣā "to decree, ordain" (see §3.12.1, n. 2b below). Accordingly, Sab. converts a *fem.* noun into a verb.

**2.9.14** CA ḥabata "to humble" (Koran 11: 23, 22: 54) is from ḥabbu "bottom of valley"; ḥubba-tu "low-lying place where water stagnates".

**2.9.15** BHeb. šebet "to sit, to dwell", CA ṯabata "be fixed, stable, firm"; ṯabātu "fixity, firmness, stability, perseverance"; ṯābitu "fixed, immovable, permanent", etc. see §3.12.14 below.

**2.9.16** CA kabata "make fall prostrate" also "humiliate and enrage" (Al 'Ayn V, 342) as in the Koran: (كَبَتُوا كَمَا كَبَتَ الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ), (Those who oppose God) *will be humiliated as were humiliated those before them* (58: 5). It is said that /-t/ is from an earlier /-d-/ (see LA); this makes the verb a derivative of [kbd], a Semitic trilateral expressing "liver, be heavy, to honor" in all Semitic languages, also "to suffer, endure" in CA. The verb

---

<sup>124</sup> In SL both ḥalat and ḥalā express "pluck out the hair", but the former is clearly understood as being from the latter. The addition of a proot /-ḥ/ to [ḥal] creates a trilateral signifying "to have *hair cut, shave*", etc.

kabata is obviously from the noun kabtu “repression” and this is in turn from kabba “to fall prostrate”. See §2.2.57.6 above for more kindred roots.

**2.9.17** CA hawta-tu [r. hwt] “abyss, low, depressed (place)”. Ašma’i rightly derives it from huwwa-tu fem. id. (ŠHH I, 271): hawā “fall down, go down”. Some trilaterals based on this proot are *hwr*, *dhwr*, *hwd*, etc. see §2.1.6.11, esp. n. 4-6 above.

**2.9.18** Phoen., Pun. šyt “to place, to put, to establish” (NWSI II, 1130), Assy. išdu “foundation, lower or hinder part” (King, 1989: 335), Ug. šyt “to put” (UG, 535), BHeb. [šyt] “to set, place, put, found” ~ šāt [r. štt] “to set, to place” (OT, 1051, 1092).

1) There is indeed a close connection between such notions as “to place, to put”, “to establish, to found > pillar, basis, column, foundation”, and “to sit with the body supported upon the buttocks”, and is orig. ‘sitting-part, seat’. The most important issue to consider and study here is the fundamental idea from which such notions have been derived.

2) CA ’istu (= Akk-Assyr. išdu) ~ sah ~ suh ~ sathu ~ satu “posterior part, anus, the anal area, buttocks”, a sixth variant is *suthum* [sthm] id., BHeb. šāt [r. šyt] in pl. “column, pillar”; šēt “the buttock” (OT, 1091), OffAram. št “buttocks, anus” (NWSI II, 1198), SA: Meh. šīt “Vulva, Penis”, Shh. šit “Hinterer”, Cush.: Som. šitto “Vulva”, Kafa šitto, etc. (Müller, 1975: 65, n. 13).

3) Words cited thus far are all related to Akk., Phoen., Pun. ’št “pillar, column”, CA ’āsiya-tu [r. ’sy] “a pillar; column, prop” also “compact or exact structure”, BHeb. ’āšyā “a support, column; foundation” (OT, 94).

4) The traditional trilaterals cited above are derivatives of late PHS \*’uš- ~ ’aš- “to found; foundation” as in Assy. aššāšu “to found”; uššu “foundation” (king, 1898: 326), BHeb. ’āšiš “foundation” (OT, 100), BAram., Jp. ’šš “foundation” (Cohen, DRS I, 35-36), CA ’assa “to establish, found, build, make firm”; ’ussu ~ ’asasu ~ ’asāsu “beginning; infrastructure, base, basis, foundation”

5) Egyp. yst “seat, throne, place, chamber” (EHD I, 79); s-yst “to occupy a seat” (EHD II, 643), st “seat, throne” ~ ys-t (EHD II, 706, I, 79). The root is also seen with prefixed caus. t ~ d: see §2.7.32 above, and with the same prefix occurring as suffix: see §2.1.14.2, under *Comments* above.

To my understanding, late PHS \*’as- is from \*-θa’- ~ ’aθ i.e. “seat, sitting”: see §2.12.14, esp. n. 2 below.

**2.9.20** OAram. kšt(’), OffAram. kšt id. pl. kštn, Pun. kšt “arch, bow” (NWSI II, 1040), BHeb. kešet “a bow” pl. kəštōt; kašet “bowman”, Akk. kaštu, Eth. kst, Mand. kašta “bow” (MD, 404): CA kausu “a bow, arch”, pl. ’aḳwāsu, kisiy, kusiyy, etc.; *kausu kuzah* “rainbow”, orig. *Satan’s bow*, and for this reason old Arab scholars and lexicographers made unsuccessful attempts to replace ‘*kuzah*’ by ‘*Allah*’ “God”, thus proscribing *kausu kuzah* and prescribed *kausu Allah*. On this particulat (/t/), Gesenius (OT, 949) writes «it was regarded as radical and changed to ʔ (/ʔ/) (giving rise to a new trilateral) as CA *kušṭa-nu* “a bow” (also “rainbow”); Syr. kšṭ “to shoot with a bow”, BAram. kəṣṭ id.; *kūšṭā* “a bow”».



**2.9.21** Akk. *dāt* “after, behind” (DRS IV, 242): Sab. *d’* “already, previously” (SD, 35), with prefixed *w-*: Ge. *wad’a* “already” (DRS III, 201), perh. CA *da’dā’u* “last days of the month”; dawādi’ pl. “last”. Proot [da’] is also seen in Te. *da’am* “last year” (DRS IV, 291) is a compound of *da’* “previous, past” and *am* “year” in CA *ām id.*, Te. *amāt id.*

**2.9.22** Akk. *bītu*, *bētu* “house”, Ug. *bt*, Phoen. *bt*, *byt*, Pun. *bt*, Moab. *bt*, EHeb. *byt*, OAram. *by* (shortened from *byt*), OffAram., Palm., Hatra, JAram. *byt id.*, CA *baitu* “house, clan”, Tham. *byt id.*, Lih. *byt* “house, temple”, Sab. *byt* “house, village, clan”, Meh. *bayt*, Soq. *beyt* “house”, Shh. *būt id.*, Ge., Te., Tna. *bet*, Amh. *bēt*, Chad.: Sura, Mupun *bit* “hut, shelter”, Bokos *but*, Kulere *’abut* “hut” (NWSI I, 157-158; SD, 34; HSED, n. 253). All are from a stem *\*buW-* or *\*biW-* “a place” as in Akk. *bī’u* “hole” = CA *bī’a-tu* fem. “house, i.e. *where a person lives, any place where people live*” (nowadays signifies only “environment”); *bā’a-tu* ~ *ma-bā’a-tu id.*; *bawa’a* “to dwell, live” as in the Koran: *نتبوا من الجنة حيث نشاء* (And God has made us inherit the earth) *we may dwell in the Garden wherever we please* (39: 74), Egy. *b’b’* “hole in the earth, cave, cavern”,; also *b*, *b’*, *bw*, etc. “abode, house”, as in *bw w’* “one place”, *bw nb* “every place”, *bw hr* “place below” (EHD I, 197, 214), Chad.: Gera, Montol *bi* “place”, Krk *biyi*, Bolewa *beyi id.*, Angas *pi id.*, Geji, Ngamo *bi* “hut”, *be’i* “place”, Zakshi *bayi* “village”, Bura *vi* “place, house”, Logone *maba*, Boka *bi-ta id.*, Mofu *mbaw* “yard”, Sokoro *ba* “place”, Cush.: Sid. *bay-*, *ba’a* “place”, Hadiya *beeyo id.*, Kambatta *bee-ccu id.* (HSED, n. 158, 244).

1) PHS proot [baW-] above is also seen in compound words, such as CA *bu’ra-tu* fem., clearly consisting of two parts [bu] “a place”, i.e. *a hole*, pl. *bu’aru*, and [’ir] “fire” as in *’ira-tu* fem. *id.* One can drop [bu] and use *’ira-tu* alone to express “fire-place”. The compound word and its pl. form are used today only as “cesspit of evil or conspiracies”.

2) Later, in the course of time, HS languages have made use of the stem, often by means of available PHS affixes to form a large number of roots having to do with ‘*dig* (in a place)’, ‘*build a place*’, ‘*return, come, or go to the place* (of residence)’, ‘*door*’, and so forth. Some illustrations are:

2a) [ba-n-] “to build, construct a house” as in Akk. *banū*, Ug. *bnw*, *bny*, Phoen. *bny*, *bn*, Pun. *bn*, *bn’*, Moab. *bnh*, EHeb. *bnh*, OAram., OffAram., Hatra, Palm., JAram., Nab. *bny*, CA *banā*, Tham., Liḥ. *bny* (NWSI I, 173-176; BRS II, 71), Berb.: Izayan, Izdeg *bnu*, Ghadames *ə-bni*, Chad.: Mubi *bēni*, Sumray *bi*, Kwang *bay*, Mobu *baye*, Lamang *b-* (HSED, n. 252, 261).

2b) [ba-n-] “dig” as in Egyp. *b’* “to dig, to plough”; *b’y* “a digging tool” (EHD I, 201), Chad.: Klr *buy*, Sha *bu*, Logone *ba id.*: (HSED, n. 159).

Closely related to “dig” is, of course, “hole” above and “field, piece of land” as in Egyp. *bn-t* “field”, Cush.: Som. *ban* “open space, plain”, Chad.: Housa *ḥuna*, Sura *bon* “field” (HSED, n. 210): CA *būnu* [bwn] “a piece of land the measure of eyeshot, boundary land”; *bānu* “ben tree”.

2c) Akk., Assy. *bā’u* “to come, go, reach”, Ug. *ba’* “to return”, CA *bā’a* “to come, return (usu. to *m-bā’a* “place of dwelling)”, Ge. *bā’a* “to enter”, Tna. *bo’e*, Te. *bā’a id.*, Har. *bō’a* “to enter, go in”, Amh. *bota* “place” (HED, 38; DRS II, 50), Phoen., Pun. *b’*

“to enter”, EHeb. b’, bw “to enter, come, go” (NWSI I, 146), Egyp. by’ “to go away”, Chad.: Tera ɓa “to come”, Wamdiu, Masa ba id., Kera bi, Kulere bo, Jimbin bo-, Diri mbu id., Sura bā “to return”, Angas be, Montol ba id., Mobu baye “to enter”, Dera bə “to go”, Kariya, Mbu, Caju ba-, Miya ba, Gabin bei, Dava va id., Gisiga be “to go away”, Berb.: Ghadames əbbi “to bring, drive”, Sewa əbba id., Cush.: Oromo ba’- “to go out”, Sid. ba- “to go away, go out”, Hadiya ba’e id., Afar ba’ “to go away” (HSED, n. 157), also in Bedja bi’ “to return home, rest, sleep”.

2d) Shifting the order of radical consonants does not result in any change of meaning, hence CA ’āba “to come back or return to one’s place”, Sab. ’by “permanent residence in a place”, etc.

2e) The Sab. cognate with HS words in (2c) above is bh’ “to enter, penetrate into enemy country for scouting” also “go in to (= prep. ’ly) a woman in her confinement”; mbh’t “entrance” (SD, 27) = CA bāhu ~ bā’u “making sexual intercourse”; bawwa’a “sleep with a woman”; bā’a-tu in *Hadith* “marriage”, developing from bā’a-tu, mabā’a-tu “place where one lives, place of residence” (LA), bahwu “house, house in front of other houses”, SL bahw “large sitting room inside a house, large entrance”.

2f) Akk. bir-t “fortress, palace”, BHeb. bīrā “fortress, castle, palace, fortified place”, BAram., Syr. bīrā id. (OT, 127), OffAram., Hatra, Palm., Nab. byrt(’) “fortress” (NWSI I, 155), Chad.: Siri bəri “place”, Buli ibəri id., Fyer bur “hut”, Mandara bəre “town”, Gudu vura-, Mwulyen vura id. (HSED, n. 359). The /-r/ here is a proot linguistically identical with -r of ḥāra-tu “quarter of a town” (see §2.1.14.3, n. 4d) and is seen in many place names as in ḥīra-h, bīra-h, etc.

**2.9.23** Sem. naṣat- “be silent” is a compound of neg. [na] and ṣawt, ṣaw “sound, voice”, vb ṣāta. HS stem [ṣawt-] is in turn a compound of PHS \*ṣaw- and -t: see §2.21.3.4 below for a detailed discussion.

**2.9.24** CA [’rt] = [’tr] in §2.8.4 below.

**2.9.25** CA [’nt] = [’tn] in §2.8.2 above.

**3.9.26** CA [ḥtf] ~ [ḥft] “death” (Al ’Ayn III, 193-194).

**2.9.27** CA ḳūt “victuals, food”, SA: Meh. ḳawt “food”, Shh. ḳit id., Chad.: Tangale kwete, kutu “food, bread” (HSED, n. 1561): Egyp. ḳ’-t “food”.

**2.9.28** Heb. nšt “dry up” is from [naš] (see §2.1.14.1, n. 3h in the last *paragraph* above).

**2.9.29** CA [brt] flat land” is from [bar] in §2.12.42, n. 2 below.

**2.9.30** CA ḥawātu “sound, noise (of a bird’s wings, etc.)”, *described as being a fem. noun in pronunciation, but masc. in semantics* (LA) < ḥaw “sound made by a bird’s wings, by wind, etc.”, orig. ‘illusory sound’ (LA): see proot [ḥaw] in §2.16 below.

**2.9.31** CA *arch.* 'aḳāta “have the power over, be able to”: ḳawiy “strong, powerful”.

**2.9.32** The last Hamito-Semitic trilateral ending with -t to be discussed here is [mwt], the most common root expressing “to die” as in Akk. mātu “to die”, Ug. mwt, Eth. mōta id. (Rabin, 1975: 87), OCan., EHeb., OAram., OffAram., JAram., Palm., Hatra, Nab., Pun. mwt “to die” (NWSI II, 605-607), CA māta “to die”, Sab. mwt “to die”; stmtw “be near death” (SD, 89) = CA CX 'istamwata ~ 'istamāta; mwt “death”, Egyp. mwt, mīt “to die”; mwmtwt “contagion, deadly disease”; m't (a phonetically different \*m) “dead body, mummy” (= CA mā'itu); m ~ mwt “death” (EHD I, 266, 288, 293, 295), Berb.: Izy emmer, Kabyl emmet “to die”, Chad.: Housa mutu “to die”, Sura, Angas, Chip muut id., Kariya miya, Maha muto, Diri matu, Bura mta, Logone, Ghadames mti: PChad: \*m-t- “to die” (HSED, n. 1751; Carnochan, 1975: 463), Cush.: Som. \*ummw-, \*am-w(t)- “to die” (RPAA, n. 600).

There are still some trilaterals beginning with [mn- & mr-] and express “die” as in Egyp. mny, mní “to die”; mny-t “death” = CA maniya-tu [mny] “death” also “(one’s) destiny” with no vb form, BHeb. mānā “a lot” (OT, 587). Egyp. mr “to die” also “be sick”; mr-t “illness, disease, fate” (EHD I, 314).

## 2.10 PHS PREFIXED /m-/

There are *four major meanings traditionally associated* with prefixed /m-/ (cf. Moscati, 1969: §12.16, O’Leary, 1969: §110) which are as follows:

1) Place, time: CA *ma*-ktabu “office” (kataba “to write”), *ma*-khā “coffee-house” (qahwa-tu “coffee”), *ma*-wliḏu “birthday” (walada “to give birth”), Akk. *mē*-tiḫu “course” (etēḫu “to go, march”), BHeb. *mā*-qōm “place”, Ug., Phoen., Hatra. *m*-qm id. (BHeb. qām “to stand up”), Eth. *me*-srāk “east” (šāraqa “to rise (the sun)”), Sab. *m*-ḥrθ “plough land” (CA ḥaraṡa “to plow”), CA *m*-w’d “appointed time” (w’d “to promise”) and can also express “appointed place” = BHeb. *m*-w’d “appointed place”.

2) Instrument: CA *mi*-ftāḥu “key” (fataḥa “to open”), *mi*-’ḏadu “cutting tool”, Ug. *m*’ṣd “reaping hook”, Eth. *ma*-’ḏad “sickle” (CA ’aḏada “to cut and reap”, Eth. ’aḏada “to reap”), BHeb. *mi*-šqōl, CA *mi*-θqālu “weight”, Phoen., Pun., Aram. mšql id. (BHeb., Aram. šql, CA θql “to weigh”), Palm. mkl “kind of liquid measure” = CA *mi*-kyālu.

3) Nouns (especially abstract and agent): Akk. *ma*-gšaru “might, strength” (gašāru “to strengthen”), *mē*-šaru “righteousness” (ešēru “be straight”), Ug. mdw “illness” (dw “be ill”), Aram. m’kl “food” (’kl “to eat”), BHeb. *ma*-’apēl “darkness” (’apēl “dark”), CA *ma*-fharah “glorious deed” (fāhara “to glory”), Sab. mrḏ “favor” (rḏy “to please”), mr’s “chief” (r’s “head”); Akk. *mu*-kaššidu “one who attacks, enemy” (kašādu “to capture, harass”), CA *mu*-’allimu “one who teaches, teacher” (’allama “to teach”).

4) Participles: CA *ma*-ktūbu “written, letter” (kataba “to write”), *ma*-ftūnu “infatuated” (fatana “to enchant, infatuate”), Akk. *na*-bnītu (mabnītu: /m/ > /n/ before a labial) “creature” (banū “to create, make”).

In Modern Standard Arabic and in all modern dialects there is a strong tendency to convert CA nouns above into verbs; that is, to create quadrilaterals from CA [m + trilateral]. Some examples are:

CA ḏahara “to appear”; maḏharu “appearance” > MSA. maḏhara, ta-maḏhara “to show, reveals itself”;

CA waḡa’a “to fall, happen”; mawḡi’u “place, position, site” > MSA ta-mawḡa’a “to take position”;

CA saḥira “to mock, ridicule”; maṡhara-tu “mockery, sarcasm” > MSA ta-maṡhara “to mock, ridicule”;

CA ḥāra “to go away from something and come back to it, roll out”; miḥwaru (inst.) “axis” > MSA ta-maḥwara “to center upon”, etc. I believe that this phenomenon, like all other similar phenomena, can be best explained as representing a continuous tendency in Semitic toward expanding its root by means of available affixes.

5) The infix /-m-/, almost like /-n-/, can be affixed anywhere in the root, esp. *in medial position*. The major difference between them, however, is that affixed /n/ is more commonly used and easier to determine than /m/. In some cases, however, the occurrence of /-m-/ could be due to dissim. as in CA CIV ’akmala [kml] “to complete, perfect, finish, conclude” = Sab. hkml “to complete (a task); CA CX ’istakmala “to accomplish” = Sab. stkml “to accomplish” (SD, 78): CA kāmīlu “perfect, complete, whole, entire”. One can say: *I gave him the money kāmāl- or kulla-*, where both signify “all” (Al ’Ayn V, 379). They are all from [kal] as in as in Assy. kalālu “to complete, be

complete”; *kališ* “completely”; *kullalu* “totality, all, the whole” ~ *kalū* [kly] “to come to an end”; *kal* “all, the whole” (King, 1898: 351), Phoen. *kly* “to complete, end” (PG, 111), BHeb. *kālā* [כלה] “be complete, perfect, finished”; *mi-klā* “completion, perfection” ~ *kālāl* [כלל] “to complete, make perfect”; *kālīl* “complete, perfect”; *mi-klōl* ~ *mi-klāl* “perfection” (OT, 468, 471, 565), OAram. *kl* “all, entire, every” (Rosenthal, AG, 11), Sab. *kl* “to complete” as a subs. “all, every, totality” (Beeston, SD, 77), CA *kullu* “all, whole, entire, every”.

Some other examples with infixed /-m-/ becoming an inseparable part of the root in CA are:

5a) *’iṣma’adda* [ṣm’d] “to go (steadily)” is, according to Azhari (see LA), from *’aṣ’ada* id., with infixed /-m-/ and doubling the last radical. Consider the following derivatives of [ṣm’d] which are, as we should expect, originally derivatives of [ṣ’d]: *muṣma’iddu* “flat (land)” = *ṣa’īdu* id.; *’iṣma’adda*, said of feet, “to swell” is from “elevated, rising” as in *mu-ṣa’ada* adj. (derived from CII “make high, make one or s.t. go up) “elevated and standing erect (said of one’s belly)”.

5b) Another example is *’iṣmaṣarra* [ṣmṣr], said of the sun, “to blaze, glow, burn with flame” is from *ṣaṣara* (LA), a compound of /ṣ-/ , from caus. /s-/ , and [ṣar] (see §2.2.48, n. 2g above).

5c) If we consider examples like *yirru* ~ *yarīru* [yr] and *yumru* ~ *yamru* ~ *yamiru* [ymr]<sup>125</sup>, we will find that both pairs express “inexperienced (said of a boy)”. Another example is *yadda* “make the eyes stare down”, n. *yaddu* and *ymd*, common stems are II *yammaḍa*, CIV *’aymaḍa* “close the eyes”<sup>126</sup>: *’inyidādu* (‘*aṭ-ṭarfi*’, a word referring to ‘the eye’ only in this context) is used interchangeably with *’inyimādu* (‘*aṭ-ṭrfi*’). A stem [yam] has already been established in §2.2.1 above, also see ft <sup>1</sup>.

6) Among other functions of [m] are:

6a) Prep. as in Egyp. *m* “at, with, from into, as, like, out from, in the condition of, etc.”, CA and *all other Sem. languages* *ma-* “with” (in compounds: see §2.17.30 below), “from” (see §2.20.1 below), “at” (see §2.10.44 below), etc.

6b) Sem. [mu] is added to adjectives to express *the superlative degree* (§§2.19.1 & 2.19.4 below), etc.

6c) Neg. element (§2.21.4 below).

**2.10.1** CA *matala* “to shake or move” < *talla*, *taltala* “to shake and move”, *malata* [mlt] “to move and shake” is a dialectal variant of *matala* id. This is in turn from *talla*, *taltala* id.

**2.10.2** CA *maṭa’a* [mṭ’] “to eat with the front teeth”. A similar meaning is expressed by *naṭa’a* [nṭ’] id. Both trilaterals are from a stem [ṭa’] “to eat” as in CA *ṭa’u* “licking”, with m-extension: OAram. *ṭm* “to eat, taste” (Rosenthal, AG, 11), Ug. *ṭm* “to eat” (UG, 532), Akk. *tēmu*, Heb *ṭā’am* “to eat, taste” (MD, 174), CA *ṭa’ima* “to taste, feed”

<sup>125</sup> As a verb *yamara* “to cover completely, as *with water*”.

<sup>126</sup> SL also has a variant root *’ammaṣ* “open and close the eyes due to a malady”.

also “to eat little with the front of the mouth”, Ge. ṭā’amā “taste”, Tna. ṭā’am, Te. ṭā’ama, Amh. ṭamā id., Har. ṭāma “be tasty, taste good”, Arg. ṭahama id. (HED, 154), Cush.: Bed. tam “essen”, Chad.: Bud. tam (Müller, 1975: 69, n. 67). The proot is also seen in the compound trilaterals [lṭ’] and [l’ṭ] “to devour” (§2.17.42 below).

1) Akk. tāu “to eat”, CA tā’a (i.e. tawa’a) *lit.* “to pass a piece of bread through a kind of yogurt or butter (and eat it, *lit. raise it to the mouth*)” (Al ‘Ayn II, 226), Soq. te, Meh. towu “to eat”, Jib. Te, Shh. te’ id. This root may share with \*ṭa’- above the same origin. To this proot belong Eyp. t’, t “bread” (Albright, JAOS 47, 1927: 232-233, n. 89), Chad.: Gera tii “to eat”, Bolewa, Kirfi tii- id., Ngamo, Ngizim, Wargla ta, Dera twi, Mubi tuwa, Jegu t- id. (HSED, n. 2343; Carnochan, 1975: 463), Cush.: HES \*iit “to eat” (RPAA, n. 159).

**2.10.3** CA makānu [r. mkn] “place”; mumkinu “may be, possible”; CII makkana “enable, make able”; CV tamakkana “make oneself able”. LA wrongly treats [mkn] as an autonomous trilateral, while ṢḤḤ (VI, 2191) correctly considers it as a derivative of [kwn]. Tha’labu also sees that initial m-: «denotes the place of kāna (= “be”) ... They (= grammarians and lexicographers) wrongly treated the prefix m- as part of the root».

On this particular issue, Farāhīdi (Al ‘Ayn V, 410) much earlier stated:

*«makān is derived from kān, and when its use became very frequent, its prefixed /m-/ was thought of as a part of the root, hence its pl. form is ’amkina-tu. It is also said ta-makkana “to enable” (thus converting the derived noun into a verb and creating a new trilateral in the language».*

Phoen., Pun. m-kn “place” (NWSI II, 624), Ug. m-knt id. (UG, 534) = CA makāna-tu “place, rank; elevated rank or position”. All are from the root in CA kāna, Phoen. kn “to be”, etc. The proot underlying this trilateral and so many trilaterals in HS has already been seen and will be seen in many sections such as §§2.2.13; 2.2.57.3; 2.2.57.4; 2.8.15 above, etc. The proot has already been established in §2.1.6.5.4, n. e, under *Comments* above.

**2.10.4** Ug. mkr “to sell; merchant” (UG, 534, 535), Akk. tamkaru “merchant” (AG, 107), Phoen. mkr “to sell; merchant” (PG, 117), Pun., OffAram. mkr BHeb. mākar “to sell”, EHeb. mkyr “vendor” (NWSI II, 624-626), Sab. mkr, coll., “merchant” (SD, 85). All are from a compound of \*m- plus stem \*kar- as in BHeb. kārā “to buy, purchase” (OT, 487), CA karā “to rent, hire” also \*kara “to sell, buy, trade” in a compound, Pun. kry “to buy” (NWSI, II, 535), etc. In Ug. the caus. š- became part of the root: škr “to hire”. The stem \*kara has already been discussed in §2.2.14 above.

As for the origin of Semitic m- in /mkr/ above, there are two possibilities: a) locative m- and, in this case, \*ma-kar- orig. meant “marketplace” or (b) agentive m-: cf. CA mu-kārī “one who transports goods”.

a) CA maḡaru [mḡr] “buying or selling a female animal (sheep, etc.) along with the fetus it carries” may be thought of as cognate. In fact, its cognate with Aram., Heb. šgr “fetus” (see §2.2.28 above).

**2.10.5** Assy. mašāru “be banded together” (King, 1898: 363) is from the root in CA šarra “to gather, bring together, wrap”, BHeb. šārar “to bind, wrap” (Ryder, 1974: 116), OffAram. šrr “to bind, wrap up, press”, Akk. šurāru “purse” (NWSI II, 976) = CA šurra-tu “purse”, also “bundle, packet, sealed bag”. Here belongs Sab. mšr “baggage camel” (SD, 88).

**2.10.6** Assy. mašāru also expresses “to divide” (King *ibid.*) = CA šarā “to cut, split” also “be gathered together”, Syr. šry “to cut, split”, Soq. šer id., Cush.: Ometo čira “to cut” (HSED, 105).

**2.10.7** CA ’amaḳḳu “tall”; maḳaḳu “tallness (usu. *excessive tallness*)”.

a) Note that CA does not often distinguish between “tall” and “long”, hence maḳḳā’u, said of a desert, “far-stretched”. The most common word for ‘tallness’ is *tūlu*, which is also the most common word for ‘length’; ṭawīlu “long, tall” as in ṭarīḳ-un ṭawīl-un “long way”, while raḡul-un ṭawīl-un = “tall man”.

b) The root in question is ultimately from \*-ḳ-, seen in many compounds as in ’ašaḳḳu = ’amaḳḳu in meaning, and in reduplication in ḳāḳu (variants are ḳūḳ, ḳīḳ, ’anḳūḳ) “tall (man, usu. exorbitantly tall)” = Egyp. ḳ’ “be high, be long”; ḳ’-t “height, length”; ḳ’ḳ’ “high, high place, hill”, in phrases such as ḳ’ ḳ’ “(the god of the) long/high arm”, etc. (EHD II, 760-761), Chad.: Sura, Chip kaa “to rise”, Mobu kaye “to fly”, Gudu k’o “to raise, lift” (HSED, 332).

Initial /m-/ of CA [mḳ] above could be a proot signifying “mountain, earth” (or perh. a *superlative suffix*: see §2.19 below).

**2.10.8** Akk. mašāru “to leave, abandon” also “to send, release” (AG, 87), Assy. mašāru “let go free, leave, abandon” (King, 1898: 365), CA masara “to free from a strained condition” (?).

a) To the root also belong, with prefixed w-, Akk. wašāru = mašāru in meaning (AG, 112), with prefixed w-, OAram. yšr “to send” (Rosenthal, AG, 11), Sab. ysr “to send, dispatch” (SD, 169) and, with prefixed /’-/, BHeb. ’āšar (§2.3.15 above).

b) CA and Akk. words above are indeed false cognates. The moment I reread the signification of CA *masara*, it became evident to me that the triliteral is based on \*sar- as in sarra (with preposition ’an) “to comfort, free from restrain” = masara above = Egyp. srsr “to comfort, relieve” (EHD II, 610): PHS stem \*šar- joy, relief, etc. §2.3.12 above. Accordingly, CA masara is from the noun masarra-tu fem.: sarra “to please”

The historical CA cognate is the noun masāru “road, track”; masīra-tu “course, road”. The form remained a noun in CA but developed into a verb in Akk. (for a similar instance, see §3.10.29, n. 4 below). This CA noun is derived from sāra “to head to, go, walk”; CII, CIV “cause to leave, send” = Akk. šāru “to go forth” (Stehle, JAOS Vol. 60, p. 525).

c) The prefixes w- (Akk.), y- (Sab., OAram.), ’- (BHeb.) are all variants of caus. \*’- as in CA CIV ’asara “to send” in the utterance ’asar-tu-hā lit. send I (= -tu-) + -hā, referring to a beast of burden and shepherds, from ’asāra also “to send” (LA, r. syr), imper. sir!

**2.10.9** Akk. maḫātu “to fall, cast down” (AG, 87), Assy. maḫātu “to fall, fall upon”; ušamḫit “to overthrow”; maḫittu “ruins” (King, 1898: 363) = CA, Sab. mḫṭ (below): PHS stem \*ḫaṭ- as in CA ḫaṭḫaṭa, with reduplication, “to go down, descend”, in Poet.: Thu Ar-Rimmah says:

«bimaḫḫudatin fī nis’i raḥlin ta-ḫaṭḫaṭa-t ’ilā (’a)l-mā’i ...» (LA);

ḫuṭṭa, esp. said of price, “to fall, go down”.

a) To this stem certainly belong CA saḫaṭa, with caus. \*š-, “to fall, drop”, *from a higher (like wall, tree, etc.) to lower position*; suḫūṭu “downfall”; CIV ’aḫaṭa “to throw down, overthrow, subtract”; CIII sāḫaṭa, said of a horse, “slacken”; sāḫiṭu “be behind”, siḫāṭu, said of a man, “becoming tired, declining in vigor or strength”, BHeb. šāḫaṭ “to rest, be still”, perh. *to lie down, recline* (OT, 1084).

b) Sab. mḫṭ-t signifies “setting of the sun” (SD, 87) and is derived from \*ḫaṭ-. It seems to be a compound of \*m- = time and \*-ḫṭ = falling: cf. CA mayribu “setting of the sun” is from ma “time” plus ḡaraba, said of the sun, “to disappear, set (sun)”.

c) To PHS stem \*ḫaṭ- also belongs CA [mḫṭ] as in māḫiṭu, said of a camel, “be wasted away (in health) and can’t move” with māḫiṭu “degraded, low” = sāḫiṭu id. = lāḫiṭu id. These three words are used, among others, as terms for *different ranks of a slave*. For example, sāḫiṭu is (perhaps historically) *a slave of māḫiṭu*, and this in turn is *a slave of lāḫiṭu*, who is “a senior slave”. For the last cited word and the reason for giving it such a higher rank, see §2.1.9.5, n. b above).

**2.10.10** Akk. maḥāṣu “to strike” (AG, 86), Assy. maḥāṣu “to smite, fight”, BHeb. mḥṣ “to smash, wound” (King, 1898: 359), Ug. mḥṣ “to strike, slay” (UG, 536), Sab. mḥḏ “to smite, defeat” (SD, 84), CA maḥaḏa “to shake or agitate with violence”, hence, also “to suffer the pangs of childbirth”, maḥaḏu “labor pains”, Ge. maḥəḏ “labor pains”, Te. māḥaṣ, Har. miḥṭi, Amh. məṭ id. (HED, 106). All are from a stem \*ḥaḏ- as in CA ḥaḏḏa “to shake, stir”, with reduplication “to shake violently”, Assy. ḥaṣaṣu “to break, smash”. To this stem also belongs, with prefixed /w-/, CA waḥaḏa “to wound, pierce with a spear” (for this prefix, see §2.12).

A variant with /-ṣ/ is seen in Ge. māḥaṣā “to hit, break, cut”, Har. māḥaṭa “to hit, beat, strike, knock”, Arg. māḥaṭa “to hit”, Gaf. maṣā id., Tna. māḥaṣā “to churn, shake milk”, Te. maḥaṣa id. (HED, 106) = CA ḥaḏḏa id.; ma-ḥiḏu “butter milk”.

#### Comments

Bin Faris (ML V, 304) defines [mḥḏ] as “the agitation of a thing (container, vessel, etc.) containing a sort of liquid or fluid substance” and [ḥḏ] “the agitation of *a wet thing*, i.e. *of a thing containing water* (ML II, 153). In SL [ḥḏ] is a root, while /mḥḏ/ is one of its derivatives. The root signifies “to shake or agitate a thing containing a liquid” and the derivative expresses “the thing that comes out or results from the action shake/agitate”, hence mḥḏ (= CA maḥiḏu); maḥaḏ (= CA maḥaḏu) above.

**2.10.11** CA mara’a “to see”, Eyp. mr “to see” (EHD I, 313): PHS \*ra’- “to see” as in CA ra’ā “to see”, mar’ā “sight” = EHeb. mr’-h “vision”: r’h “to see” (NWSI II, 689),



Sab. r', r'y "to see" (SD, 113), and with -t becoming part of the root, thus creating an internal change in the phonological structure of the proot: Sab. rwt, ryt "discretion, decision" (SD, 119) = CA ru'ya-tu "vision, view"; ra'y "suggestion, provision, idea, opinion", Phoen. yr't "regard, respect" (NWSI I, 468), etc.: PHS stem \*mar- "to see with the eye", is a compound of \*-m- and \*-r-, one of which means "eye" and the other "see". Egyp. m, for example, expresses "see, behold"; m' "to see, look at; sight, vision"; with neg. /n ~ nt/ nt m' "unseen, invisible" ~ n m' id. (EHD, 266, 340), and so does yr "to see; look, vision, pupil of the eyes" (EHD I, 266, 68) = CA [r'] also [r] see §§2.7.11 & 2.7.31 above. The Egyp. root also expresses "eye" as in mw nw yr-t "water (mw) from (nw) the eye (yr-t)", i.e. tears (EHD I, 293). By prefixing caus. ' - to \*mar-, we get a Semitic trilateral ['mr] signifying "to see", etc. (see §2.3.6 above). The stem is also seen in §2.17.2 below.

To PHS [ma'] may belong with prefixed \*-t- Akk. tamū "to speak", Phoen., Pun tm' "chief, commander" (NWSI II, 1218-1219). The Akk. verb also denotes "to swear" (Gelb, 1961: 190): see §§2.3.7- 2.3.8 above.

**2.10.12** CA māra, tamāra "to lie" as in the Koran (53:55): رَبِّكَ تَمَارَى, also "be skeptical, to doubt" < rā'ā "to show a belief that one does not actually hold; be hypocritical"; murā'u "hypocrisy" < ra'ā "to see"; CIV 'arā "to show"; riyā'u "hypocrisy".

It seems evident that the prefix \*m- is orig. inst.: cf. māra also signifies "to mirror", and this is unquestionably from mir'ā-tu "mirror", the inst. of ra'ā "to see" (§2.10.11 above).

**2.10.13** Akk. mūšu "night" (AG, 89), Assy. mušītu "night" (King, 1898: 364), BHeb. 'emeš "night, darkness" (OT, 69), CA musyu (with a variant masā'u, *the only one in use in modern times in all forms of Arabic*) "evening"; musyu 'amsi "yesterday evening" (both musyu and 'ams are from the same trilateral root), Tham. mms' id. (Branden, 1950: 515), Ge., Te. məset "evening", Ge. mäsyä "become evening", Tna. mäsäyā, Te. mäsa, Har. māša id., Amh., E., Ed., M., Ms., Go., A. mäsšä(m), etc. (EHD, 113), Egyp. ms "supper, evening bread"; mswt "provisions for the night"; msīt "evening meal"<sup>127</sup> (EHD I, 323), Chad.: Gudu məšu "shadow", Cush.: Iraqaw əmsi "middle of the night", Burunge amasi id., Kawadza amasiya "tomorrow" (HSED, n. 38).

PHS proot \*šuW- "night, evening, darkness" as in Egyp. sw "evening", sw', swī "night, darkness" (EHD II, 592, 648, 649), Akk. šiwī-tu "evening" (HSED, n. 552). Prefixed \*mu- in all words above has the meaning "time of" as in CA mayribu "time of sunset" (yaraba-t "to set, of sun), Ug. m'rb "sunset", i.e. *time of sunset*: ['rb] "to set, of sun" (UG: 536, 535). The original meaning of the compound is thus "night time or time of the evening".

a) It is worth-noting that upon the adoption of prefixed \*m- "time" as part of the root, the word has come to express 'evening' or 'night' independently of the notion of 'time'.

<sup>127</sup> In CA terms for ظهر 'noon' and مساء "evening" are not associated with food, while most others are: cf. CV ta'ašša "to eat at nightfall, to super"; 'ašā'u "supper, dinner" = Egyp. 'š' "food" (EHD I, 138).

If a Semitic language needs to express ‘*time of the evening*’, for example, it will most likely prefix another \*mu- “time” to the word: cf. CA Poet. Umaiya Bin Abi Ṣalt says:

«’al ḥamdu lillāhi *mu-msā-nā* wa *mū-ṣbaḥa-nā*...», *thank God in the time of our evening and in the time of our morning* (LA). Tham. also provides the same type of evidence. Its word is to be analyzed as \*m- (= CA Poet. mu- above) + \*-m- (= CA m- in msā-) and the proot \*-suW- (= CA -sā).

b) Based on evidence provided by Akk. and CA words, we may reconstruct a morpheme \*mu- expressing “time (of)” = Egyp. /m/ = *of time* as in *m šmw* “in the summer”, *m grḥ* “in the night”, etc. (EG, §162, 2). This morpheme has a variant [ma-]. It is interesting to note that the variant [ma-] is often [mu-] in SL as in *muṣrib* = CA *maṣribu* “time of sunset” above. The proot \*šuW- occurs in many compounds: see, for example, §§2.1.6.5.23-24 above.

c) One may note that not only Semitic adopted /m-/ as part of the root, but also Egyp. and other Hamitic language divisions as we have just seen above.

**2.10.14** CA *ma’kī*, *mu’ku*, etc., pl. *ma’ākīy* or *ma’ākī* lit. “rear part of the eye or its front” but, according to Jawhari (LA, r. *m’k*), lit. “edge of the eye to the side of the nose”. The trilateral is cited as [mwk] in Al ‘Ayn V, 234 and derives into *mūku* “rear part of the eye” and *māka* “front part of the eye”. Whatever the exact meaning of the word may be and regardless of the phonetic nature of the second radical whether it is /-’/ or /-w-/ , it is quite evident that the word denotes a ‘location’ of part of the eye. The ‘location’ or ‘place’ is commonly expressed in CA as well as other HS languages by the addition of the prefix /ma-/.

Ibn Sikkīt sees that «*There are only two words in CA on the pattern of /maFxiL/, i.e. with a short /i/ (kasrah) after the 2<sup>nd</sup> radical: ma-’kīy and ma-’wīy “shelters”*» (ṢḤḤ IV, 1553; LA). The latter form cited by Ibn Sikkīt {*ma’wīy*} is from *’āwā* [r. *’wy*] “to give shelter” (§3.7.30 below), *ma’kīy* should accordingly be from a CA lost verb \*’ākā- “to see with the eye” [r. *’ky*], seen in some compound words to be discussed below and also in *’aiḳāha* “to understand”. An obvious derivative of *’aiḳ-* is [ykn] as in *yaḳīnu*, which expresses a meaning opposite of ‘doubt’ as far as knowledge is concerned: *yaḳīna* “know for sure, be certain, be sure”. Cognates in related languages are Egyp. *ḳ’ḳ* “to pry into, peep, look at” (EHD II, 762), Chad.: Maha *kai* “to see”, Boghom *kwa*, Ngizim *ika*, Tumak *ka id.* (HSED, n. 1522). I strongly believe that OAkk. *ḳ’* “to wait” (Gelb, 1961: 187), BHeb. *ḳwh* “to wait for, expect anything, hope for” (OT, 917), Sab. *ḳyw* “to wait” (SD, 112), etc. are from the proot under discussion and = CA in *ḳuwā* “mind”. It must be born in mind that notions like ‘wait’, ‘hope for’, and ‘look for, look, see’ are often derived from the same root<sup>128</sup>.

1) There are still other trilaterals in which the root \*-ḳ- is found. One of which is [mḳl], which owes its existence to the adoption of \*m-, *an agent noun prefix* (cf. CA

<sup>128</sup> Comp. CA *naḍara* “to look, see”; CVII *’intaḍara* “to wait (for)”, and HS *\*man* “to think; to wait, to remain; mind”. In Leb. and other Arabic dialects *’istanna* “to wait” is unquestionably from a PHS proot \*na-, and this proot has been discovered in §2.8.22, esp. n. 8 above. Also, comp. Lith. *laukti* “to wait, await” = Lett. *lukāt* “to see”, Skt. *lok-* “to look” = CA *laka’a* “to stay” = Lith. *likti* “to remain, stay”. It is to be noted that IE *\*man-* expresses the same meanings as that of HS *\*man-*.

mu- id.), as part of the root \*'ḳ-. Evidence on which this judgment is based is as clear as sunshine. The base form of this trilateral is not the verb *maḳala* “to look at, see”, but rather *muḳla*-tu, fem., “pupil of the eye”. Al-Laḥyāni (see LA, r. mḳl) says that the verb *maḳala* as in «*mā maḳala-t 'aini miṯla-hu* “my eye didn’t see like him”, *is from muḳla-tu*». Thus the verb *maḳala* is from the noun *muḳla*- by conversion, *defined here as a process by which a word changes its grammatical class without the addition of a consonantal affix*. In fact the process of conversion is a common process of word formation in CA. Any noun in CA, even a term *for a part of the body, for a thing in the physical world*, and so forth, can be converted into a verb by modifying the root vowel, hence *ra'su* “head” > *ra'asa* “to head, preside over”, *fāhu* “mouth” > *fāha* “to speak”, *yadu* “hand” > *yad-* “to strike or beat the hand of” (Al 'Ayn, VIII, 102), *ḥasanu* “fair” as a vb *ḥasuna* and as a n. *ḥusnu*, *kabīru* “big” as a vb *kabura*, *nuḥā'* or *naḥā'* “spinal cord” as a verb *naḥā'a* “to cut the spinal cord”, and so on. In many cases, however, the change occurs without modifying the root vowel, esp. *when the last radical is weak*, as in *manā* “destiny” as a vb *manā* “to destine”, *kafā* “enough” as a vb *kafā* “be enough”. This phenomenon is also noted in all other Semitic languages with different proportions, e.g. Ug. 'yn “eye” (gen. Sem. id.) > 'yn “to see” (UG, 535), in CA 'ayn “eye” and 'āyana CIII “to see, view, examine”.

1a) LA states that: «*It has been said that muḳla-tu (fem.) is so-called because it does the seeing*». This makes its initial mu- an agentive prefix (< Proto-Sem. \*mu-): cf. CA *rašaya* (*rašā*) “to bribe” > *muršiya*-tu, fem., “briber”, *'adraba* “to be on strike” > *mudriba*-tu, fem., “one who is on strike”, *taḥima* “feel heavy with food”, masc. n. *muthamu*; fem. *muthama*-tu, etc. It can thus be said that *muḳla*-tu was originally \**mu-ḳi-la*-tu fem.; later, the glottal stop /ʔ/ dropped, medial /-i-/ was deleted to keep the word distinct from the passive stem *FuḡiLa* (cf. CA *su'ila* “be asked”, *kutiba* “be written”, and so forth) and \*m- became a part of the root.

1b) It is important to note that the compound \*-ḳ- + \*-l- has developed into a root in Cushitic and Chadic languages as in Chad.: *Ndam kə:la* “to see”, *Jego 'akal-* id., Cush.: *Sid.*, *Xamir kal-* id., Cush.: *Xamta ḳaal*, Som. *ḳollaali* “to see” (HSED, n. 1581). The fact that HS has compound roots of synonymous elements will be investigated in §2.17 below. For proot [*'al* or *la'*], see §2.17.2 below.

2) A third trilateral containing the proot \*'ḳ- is [ḥdḳ] “look fixedly at, stare” also “be sharp-sighted”, a compound of \*ḥad- plus \*'aḳ-. The root [ḥd] denotes in CA “sharp, be sharp, quick” = Heb. *ḥādad* id. (OT, 296) = OAkk. 'dd, i.e. \*ḥdd “be quick” (Gelb, 1961: 178). The trilateral does not mean to “see” in CA unless is used with a word having to do with “eye” or “seeing” like [bṣr] and [ndr], etc. Thus «*ḥadda baṣarahu 'ilaihi*» “(he) fixed the pupils of his eyes on him, stared at him” = *ḥaddaḳahu 'ilaihi* id. (LA, r. ḥdd): CA *baṣar-* “sight, seeing” -hu “his”, *'ilai-hi* “on him”, *ḥaddaḳa*-hu = “fix pupils of his eyes on him” (i.e. ‘stare at’). The surface meaning of [ḥdḳ] may suggest exactly as we have just mentioned: [ḥadd] = “stare” and \*'aḳa- = “pupil of the eye”. The real meaning of the word, however, is “see with the pupil of the eyes” and is from {ḥdy + \*-aḳ-}, with \*ḥadā “to see” and \*'ḳ- “pupil of the eyes” (see the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph below): cf. Ug. *ḥdy* “to see” (UG, 535), Assy. *iḏū* id. (King, 1898: 333), CA *ḥadā* ~ *ḥadaya* “to investigate, inquire into”.

2a) It is possible that the 2<sup>nd</sup> {ḥida'} in the following proverb has to do with “see beforehand”: «ḥida' ḥida' warā'aki bunduḡahu» (Nisābūri, Amthāl I, p. 201, n. 1061) = SL ḥidi' “showing quick understanding, keen, discerning”. The survival of this word in SL proves that the 1<sup>st</sup> interpretation of the proverb is correct, whereas the 2<sup>nd</sup> interpretation, as advanced by Abu Ubaidah, is wrong (see both interpretations in the reference).

2b) Putting {ḥadā} above and \*ḡ- together, we get \*ḥad'aḡa. If you try to pronounce the word rapidly, you will find yourself saying \*ḥaddaḡa, with \*/-'/ being assimilated completely to the preceding /-d-/, becoming \*-d-, and has wrongly been considered throughout the history of the language as CII stem of [ḥdḡ].

3) We have just demonstrated above that muḡla-tu is from a word [\*'uḡl]. This reconstructed form is seen in the quadriliteral ḥadḡala “turning or moving round the eyes”, from \*ḥād'uḡla- (impossible to pronounce) > becoming (by shortening the long vowel /-ā-/ and dropping /-'u-/ for ease of pronunciation) ḥadḡala whose meaning is the sum of the meanings of its two parts: cf. CA ḥād- “turn aside”.

4) The same \*-ḡl- is seen (by metathesis) as \*-lḡ- in a number of additional compounds. One of them is SL baḡla' (i.e. baḡlaḡ) “to look intently at as if you inquire of s.t”.

#### Comments I

I have found it unwise to close this section without bringing to light two important facts:

a) Akk.-Assyr. idū (n. 2 above) is traditionally considered as a derivative of idū “to know”, i.e. from the same root in Ug. yd' “to know” (UG, 533), Phoen., Pun., EHeb., OffAram. yd' id. (NWSI I, 439441), Sab. h-yd' caus. “make known to” (SD, 167): CA mu-īdu, by metathesis, “knowledgeable”. This confusion is due to the reduction of Akk. laryngeals (except /h/) and semivowels /y, w/ into a single sound /ʔ/. In accordance with this fact, Akk. idū “to see” is from [ḥdy], while idū “to know” from [yd'], and Semitists' view- even on such an obvious surface matter- is wrong.

b) Like [ḥdḡ] in (2) above, [ḥdḡ] expresses a similar meaning “to look with piercing eyes, glare”. Are \*-ḡ- and \*-ḡ- old variants of the same morpheme? Frankly, I cannot tell. It is, however, important to note that \*-ḡ-, like \*-ḡ-, also seen in some other trilaterals, e.g. with an affix /-m-/ as in CA ḡaḡma-tu fem. “eye”, ḡaḡma “to look fixedly at”; ḡuḡāmu “eye disease”; 'aḡḡamu “having flaming eyes”, Himyarit ḡaḡma-tā dual “eyes of a lion = CA ḡaḡma-tā dual id. in Poet.” (Al 'Ayn III, 88; LA), Egyp. g'mḡ (perh. by metathesis) “to see, perceive, look upon” ~ gmḡ id., caus. s-gmḡ “make to see” (EHD II, 802, 808, 627). Also CA [ḡmḡ] (perh. by shifting the order of radicals) in ḡammaḡa lit. “to narrow the eyes in order to enhance one's ability to see”; ta-ḡmḡḡu “wide opening of the eyes”, esp. in a surprise and the like. Related trilaterals [ḡḡh] and [wgḡ] have already been studied in §2.2.33 above.

c) It is indeed difficult to determine whether the initial radical is originally /g/ or /ḡ/. CA provides conflicting evidence in this regard; it has both: roots beginning with \*ḡaḡ- (e.g. ḡḡd) and have to do with the “eye” as well as roots beginning with [ḡḡ-] as in ḡāḡibu “eyebrow, brow” (and without -b), ḡiḡāḡu “bone round the eye, eyebrow bone”

(Har. ḥēḡa “to look, look at, watch something”, Arg. ḥanḡa “to see”, Gaf. aḡḡä, Amh. ayyä, etc. connected with Heb., Aram. ḥzh “to gaze, look, see”: cf. HED, 81).

My real problem with prefixed /ḥ-/ is not the ability to give a long list of different roots proving that it is a prefix, but rather to determine precisely its signification. Is \*ḥ- and old variant of \*- (cf. ‘ain “eye”) or a prefix? See *Comments II* below.

f) I have also found it here unwise to close the section without recording an important observation with regard to [ḥdg] and [ḥdk], which, as we have seen in (b) above, express similar meanings. Their initial /ḥ-/ appears to be one of, at least, three proots agglutinated together to give rise to the two trilaterals under discussion. This is certainly a fact not an assumption or hypothesis. To test this fact, one can subtract the proot \*ḥ- from both trilaterals and arrive at two compounds \*dag- and \*daḡ-, which express the same deep notion as [ḥdg] and [ḥdk]: cf. Egyp. dg “to look at, see” ~ dk’ id. (EHD II, 890, 891). In CA [dk] expresses, esp. in PIP and proverbs, “make appear, manifest, show, open to view” as in the old expression: «la’aduḡḡanna šuḡūraka», *Verily* (= la-), *I* (will) certainly show (= CIV ’aduḡḡu-nna) your (= -ka) affairs (šuḡūru) (LA), and in the PIP of Zuhair Bin Abi Salma:

«tadāraktumā ‘absan wa ḡubyāna ba’damā  
tafānū wa daḡḡu bainahum ‘iṭra manšimi» (DL, L. 20).

BAram., Syr. dūḡ “to look around, to keep a look out”, Syr. ṭūrā dā-dawḡā “portes d’observation”, BHeb. dāyēḡ perh. “a watch-tower, specula”, according to Gesenius, “a tower, erected by besiegers to overlook and harass a city”, Mand. duḡ “to look at, gaze on, discern, spy out”; diḡata “visions, appearances” (OT, 218; DRS IV, 238; MD, 105, 108). It is evident here that the trilateral is a compound of [da’] “cause” and \*-ḡ- “eye”. The same proot [-ḡ-] is seen in other compounds: see, for instance, §3.13.25 below.

g) Evidence set forth above suggests that PHS had a proot \*-g- or \*-ḡ- denoting “eye”, and that CA ḥmḡ ~ ḡmḡ and Egyp. g’mḡ are from late PHS compound \*-g- “eye; to see”. As for \*ḡam-, it may denote in some languages “to see” as in JAram., Palm. ḡmy “to see” (NWSI I, 381). This notion is derived from “protect, guard, watch” as in CA ḡamā, etc. id.

### *Comments II*

Although Semitic /g/ and /ḡ/ are phonologically quite different; the former is a voiced velar stop and the latter a voiceless pharyngeal fricative, yet they unjustifiably interchange position with each other in a good many words and even roots as in CA ḡafa’a ~ ḡafa’a, ḡāḡā ~ ḡāda, nāfiḡa-tu ~ nāfiḡa-tu, ḡaḡḡā ~ ḡaḡḡā, nubāḡu ~ nubāḡu, etc. (Siyuṭi, Muzhir I, 541-542), CIV ’aḡamma ~ CIV ’aḡamma “to draw near, approach”, ḡss ~ ḡss “touch, feel; five senses”, ḡuwwa-tu ~ ḡuwwa-tu “color of rust, brow”; CVII ’indaḡaḡa ~ ’indaḡaḡa “to crack, split”; ḡarḡu ~ ḡarḡu “chink, crack, split”, ḡinnu “a type of jinn, mean jinn, feeble jinn, a race between jinn and human beings”, ḡinnu “jinn”, ḡāsa ~ ḡāsa (LA). Moreover, this very same interchange was not foreign to PHS itself: cf. stems \*ḡam ~ \*gam “burn”, \*ḡar ~ \*gar- “heat”, etc.

### *Comments III*

It is equally amazing to find such trilaterals as [ḡḡm] and [ḡḡr] that look as if they

were derivatives of [gm] and [gr] respectively: cf. CA ḡaḥama "to light a fire, to kindle"; ḡaḥḥama "to burn, to flame"; ḡaḥīmu, like ḡahannamu, "a great fire burning" also "hell" (Koran 5: 10, 81: 12, etc.), BHeb. ḡhl (-l from -m) seen in ḡaḥelet "a coal, burning coal". The earlier Heb. form was preserved in a pers. name Gaham, son of Nahor, whose original meaning might be "having flaming eyes" = CA pers. name 'Aḡḥam id. (OT, 189), Eth.: Har. (tä)gāḥama "become red-hot", Te. gāḥam "charcoal", Z. gəm "embers", Amh. gamä "be hot" ~ galä id., Cush.: Ga. gimi "embers". In Har. ḡīḥ "embers", perh from [ḡhm] with weakening of /-m/ (HED, 70; DRS II, 112-113).

As for [ḡhr]: Eth.: Te. gāḥarä ~ gāharä "to burn, be incandescent", Talm. ḡḥr ""red" (DRS II, 113). In the light of the fact that PHS has [gm], [gr], [ḥar] and [ḥam] denoting "burn, fire", one may consider them blends: gaḥam- is a blend of *gam* + *ḥam* and gaḥar - of *gar* + *ḥar*. The real fact, however, is that they are not blends, and that [ḡ] is a proot. For the meaning of this new proot see §3.17.83 below.

**3.10.15** Akk. maššaktu, massaḫtu "burnt offering", Aram. mskḥ (NWSI II, 666), CA mušḥa-tu "burning"; CIV 'amšaḥa, said of a garment, "to burn", masaka "make a place for a fire in the ground and then cover the fire with ashes or wood". It is amazing to find that the same meaning is expressed by masaka and by ḥaḥaba.

1) Other meanings expressed by ḥaḥaba are "to light, shine (a star)"; ḥāḥibu "piercing radiance" as in the Koran: (النجم الثاقب), (It is) *the star of piercing radiance* (86:3); ḥiḥābu "a match; spark; flint, etc. used to kindle a fire". The verb ḥaḥaba also denotes "to make a hole or a bore, bore through". It is equally amazing to find that CA mišḥu ~ 'amšāḥu, said of a garment, "having holes or bores" (Jamharah III, 1297).

2) It seems that Akk. [mšk/msk] and CA [msk/mšk] are from a word \*m + ḥkw. The trilateral \*ḥkw becomes [ḥkb] in CA, with /-w/ > /-b/. This trilateral is seen in Eyp. škw "fire, fuel" ~ tk "spark, fire, lamp" ~ tkw "flame, lamp" as a vb tkí (EHD II, 702, 844-845), and is ultimately from a compound of \*-ḥ- "fire" and \*ḥW- "hole, abode". For /-ḥ-/, see below, and for \*ḥW-, see §2.12.40 below. The original meaning of the compound is "fire-hole".

3) The proot \*-ḥ- is seen as /-š-/ in PSem. as in Akk. 'iš-t, Ug. 'iš-t, BHeb. 'eš, Phoen., OAram. 'š, etc. id. (DRS I, 35). The compound is found in CA with infixed -n- in 'anīsa-tu "fire", also in 'ās "ashes", but not in sū'a "fire" (Koran, 30: 10). I do not know the exact signification of -ḥ-, though I sense that it has nothing at all to do with "fire", and that it is identical with that of CA 'arraḥa "to kindle a fire, make a fire" and of ḥaraḥa "to plow". It is to be noted here, however, that even ḥaraḥa also expresses "to kindle a fire". SL ḥarr also denotes "to stir, agitate"; ḥarḥir, said of pot or kettle containing water placed on fire, "the noises made by water as it begins to boil". A large number of HS roots for "fire", including [ʾš or ʾḥ] will be given a profound study in §2.17.1 below.

#### Comments

1) One may wonder why I cite [msk] as variant of [mšk] above. The reason is obvious; one cannot pronounce a sequence /msk/. If one insists, however, on pronouncing the sequence, he will end up pronouncing mazaḥa (= mašaḥa above) "to

tear, rend, bore, as *clothes*”; *mizka*-tu fem. “piece of clothing”, thus creating a new trilateral [mzk] as in this verse of poetry:

«biḥaḡinātin yataθakḡabna (ʾa)l buhar  
kaʾannamā yamziḡna bi(aʾ)l laḥmi (ʾa)l ḥawar» (LA).

One should note that both CV *yataθakḡabna* [θkb] and CI *yamziḡna* express “to bore”, and that in both final /-na/ signifies ‘insistence’ or ‘confirmation’.

1a) There is a different trilateral [mzk] as in *mazzaḡa* “to sing”, this has nothing to do with MSA and dialects *mūsīḡa* “music”; *mūsīḡāru* “musician”, etc. with no verbal form, a direct loan from French *musique* (< Lat. *musica* < Grk *mousikē*).

The word is from [zk] as in *zakḡa*, or by reduplication *zakḡazakḡa*, “to sing, as a bird”, i.e. ‘to chirp’; coll. n. *zakḡazakḡa*-tu; *zuḡḡu* “a kind of bird”; *zakḡa*, said only of a bird, “to feed its chicks with the beak”. Nowadays, the most widely used term for “to feed with the beak (a bird)” is CII *zakḡama* of *zakama* id.: CA *zakama*, *zakḡama* id. In CA the meaning of the root also extended to “swallow, etc.”

To my knowledge, [-m] of [zkḡm] is linguistically identical with that of [tʾm] “feed” (§3.10.2 above), and the original signification may be “out from” or, less likely, “mouth”.

1b) An etymologically different [mšk] expresses “lines (stripes) in the legs of animal” (MA, 376), from *mu-waš-šaḡ-*, and belongs in part to a family of roots including *brḡš*, *wšm*, *rsm*, *nmš*, *nḡš*, *ršm*, *wsm*, *brš*, *rḡš*, *wšḡ*, etc.: see §2.15.24 below.

**2.10.16** CA *mašaḡa* “to tear, rend”; *mašīḡu*, *mamšūḡu*, adj., “lean, emaciated”; *mašḡu* “pulling something in order to make it *taller* (or longer)”, *mišḡa*-tu “worn out (of clothes)”. The trilateral is of two obvious origins:

a) *šaḡḡa* “to split, tear, rend (lengthwise)”

b) *ʾašaḡḡu* “tall”; *šuḡḡa*-tu “far; long distance”, hence *šaḡḡa ʾu maḡḡa ʾu*, said only of a horse or man, “tall” (for *maḡḡā ʾu* “tall, lofty”, see §2.10.7 above); *ta-šaḡḡaḡa* “become lean, emaciated”.

**2.10.17** CA *mataka* “to cut” < CA *takka* “to cut, cut off”, *tukka* pass. “be cut”, hence “tear off, spoil”.

a) SL *tūk* “flaw” as a verb: *tauwak* “to damage, impair; spoil”, Egyp. *twʾk*, *tʾk* “to destroy” (EHD II, 824).

In Phoen. *tk* expresses “middle” and so does BHeb. *twk*, which expresses both “oppression” and “middle” (OT, 1098, NWSI II, 1214) = CA *hutka*-tu, with prefixed *h-*, “middle of the night”, BHeb. *təkāk-īm* pl. “spoiling, oppression” (OT, 1104), Phoen. *tkk* “harass, oppress” (PG, 155), Akk. *takāku* “to press”, CA *takka* “to beat down with the feet so as to *break, crush, or destroy*”, Egyp. *tkk* “to attack, invade, thwart” (EHD II, 845), Cush.: Afar *tak* “to strike”, Kaffa *tuk-* “to hit, strike”, Chad.: Housa *tāka* “to trample, step on”, Ngizim *tak-* id., Ngamo *tako* “to beat”, Logone *tku* “to strike” (HSED, n. 2416). All are based on \*ʾak “destroy” (§2.1.6.5.1 above).

**2.10.18** CA *mayada* “to suck”; CIII *ʾamyada* “to suckle”, the underlying meaning ‘get nourishment through sucking’: *mayada* “be nourished” < *ta-ḡadda* “to have breakfast”;

γadā'u "breakfast" (in MSA and all dialects the two words mean "to have lunch" & "lunch" respectively).

In returning to mayada, we find that the word also signifies "become tall (said of grass, man, plant, etc.)", as a result of good nourishment. To this word the caus. \*s- is added: sammaydu "tall" from \*samyada "cause to become tall"; musmayiddu "swollen", a meaning also expressed by mayda-tu, thus γad > myd > smyd.

**2.10.19** CA maθāna-tu [r. mθn] "urinary bladder", i.e. *place of urine*: \*θyn "urine" as in Ug. θn-t id.; θyn "to urinate" (UG. 536), Akk. šānu id., Man. tun "urinate", etc. (MD, 483), BHeb. šāyin "urine", Syr., Eth. šyn "mingere" (OT, 1050): PHS \*θy-.

a) Wrong cognates are Chad.: Mocha mo:sso "baby", Cush.: Afar mooy, mootā "baby goat", Egyp. ms "child, calf" (RPAA, n. 599). The Chad., Cush., and Egyp. words are cognates with Ug. mθ, etc. see §2.17.71 below.

**2.10.20** CA mā'ida-tu fem. "food (placed) on the table" is a compound of m- "place" and \*'id- "food". It occurred twice in the Koran as in (انزل علينا مائدة من السماء), (O God) *send unto us from heaven a table set with food* (5:114).

1) LA states that «mā'idatu is so-called because it is 'given' (= mīda) by the host», i.e. the host 'gave, offered' it to his guests: māda "to give"; mumtādu "one who is expected to give".

LA's statement is an attempt to connect two ideas "food" and "give" generally believed to be derived from the same trilateral. Of course, we don't expect LA to state that two proots \*'ad- "to eat; food" and \*dW- "to give" fell together into [myd] upon their adoption of prefixed \*m- as an inseparable part of the root. For the reconstructed PHS \*daW-: cf. CA 'adda [r. 'dy] "to give, hand, deliver", etc., see §2.11.6 below.

It seems that [ʾad] and [ʾad] are variants of one form. The original form may be \*'ad- or \*'ad- (see §2.17.43 below), and both sounds interchange position in the language. It is to be noted, however, that one can neither say \*mā'ida-tu nor \*ma'ida-tu. If we shorten the long vowel of the first word, we will get ma'ida-tu "stomach".

**2.10.21** CA maḥša "to burn (usu. *hide/skin*)"; CVIII 'imtaḥša "be burned", pre-Islamic miḥāšu denotes "representatives of different tribes gather round a fire to conclude an alliance" as in the PIP of Nabīyah:

«ḡammi' miḥāšaka yā Yazīda fa'innanī

'a'dadtu Yarbū'an lakum wa Tamīmā» (DN, p. 99, L. 1).

1) The trilateral developed from a stem [ḥaš] in Egyp. ḥšḥs "to burn" (EHD I, 510) and in CA ḥašša "to burn" as in the PIP of Antarah:

«wa ka'anna rubban 'aw kuḥailan mu'ḡadan

ḥašša ('a)l wuḡūdu bihi ḡawāniba ḡumḡumi» (TŠ, p. 234, L. 49).

2) The trilateral under discussion derives into *miḥāššu* inst. "a bar used to stir the fire" which clearly tells that /m-/ is a prefix, i.e. *inst.* Based on this evidence, it may be said that /m-/ of [mḥš] is orig. an inst. form. Admitting that /m-/ is an inst. form does not mean that the problem with this root is over, since the /-m-/, which has been kicked out from the doorway, will not give in; it will come back through the window with its entire



*kith* and *kin*. Consider the following CA roots:

2a) 'aḥmaša CIV of [ḥmš] “to flame up a fire; to burn”; 'iḥtmaša “burst with anger”.

2b) [ḥmδ] “intense heat”.

2c) [ḥmd] ḥamada-tu “the noise produced by a fire when it is flamed up”. It is also a term for “fire”. The widely used trilateral to express such meanings and many others is [ḥdm].

2d) ḥami'a “be angry” ~ ḡami'a id.

2e) [ḥmt] (see §2.9.5 above). For some other kindred triliterals, see §2.1.6.9, n. 1j above. For their ultimate origin, see §2.2.6 above and §2.13.24 below.

3) Like [ḥš] above, CA also has [ḥs] “to burn”, but is deeply associated with notion “of feeling”. With the presence of a number of triliterals based on [ḥs], I find myself obliged to study them; otherwise a single root would have been ignored.

3a) In many modern dialects, including Syrian, *ḥauwas* “to fry, roast (meat)”. This very same meaning is expressed in CA by *ḥamasa*. A similar meaning, though with a different application, is expressed in Leb. and other dialects by *ḥammaša* “to toast bread” (see §2.1.6.9, n. 1j above).

4) It is unscientific to utter a judgment on the triliterals cited above without considering other roots that may or may not be related to them. The most relevant of such roots is [ḡmš], which expresses a number of root meanings, among them are:

4a) ḡamaša “to burn”, perh. from \*ḡaW- a term for the sun, just like ḥmš above (ḥms “very hot”; ḥamīs “oven”, ḥmš, etc. above) from a term ḥaW- “sun”: reread my *Comments* in §2.1.6.5.5 above.

4b) ḡamaša “cut the hair, esp. its nawra-tu” (LA). I don't know the signification of nawra-tu; its perh. “pointed end”, since the verb also signifies “to milk with fingertips” and, on the other hand, ḡamma “to cut off plant-tips”: Egyp. gmš “hair, lock, tress” (EHD II, 808).

4c) ḡamaša “to flirt with a woman; pinch lightly, play with, utter sweet words, etc.” The word is a compound of [ga'] “a type of” and [mas, maš, < maθ] “touch” (see §2.17.83 below).

**2.10.22** Phoen. mn “vessel, precious object”, BAram., Talm. m'n, mn, OAram. m'n “vase, vessel”, OffAram. m'n id., JAram. mn id., Pun. m'nn “maker of vase” (NWSI II, 588f; PG, 120)), BAram. m'n “vase, vessel, utensil” (OT, 531): PHS stem ['in-] as in Akk. unūt, enūt “vase”, CA 'inā'u id. (DRS I, 25).

**2.10.23** CA mafāḡa-tu, said of a man, “peevish, foolish” < faḡḡu “rude”, developed from fiḡḡu “unripe”. The original meaning of faḡ- is “passage between mountains”: CA faḡḡu “large path between mountains” also “gap” = Egyp. pg “gap”. CA 'ifḡīḡu “large valley” = Egyp. pg “valley, passage, defile, ravine” (EHD I, 252): cf. CA mu-fiḡḡu, said of legs, “distant from each other”; faḡḡu is the term used for “anything which is far”. See [n-pg] in §2.11.28 below.

**2.10.24** BHeb. m'k “to press, compress, be pressed” (OT, 596; Ryder, 1974: 112), CA

ma'aka "to rub down, crush" also "beat, triumph over (in wars)", etc. see §2.8.36 above: PHS proot \*'ak- ~ \*'ak- (§2.1.6.5.1 above).

**2.10.25** OAkk. mš' "to reach" (Gelb, 1961: 190), BHeb. mš' "to attain to, arrive at, reach any thing", Eth., Syr., BAram. mš' id. (OT, 604f), CA madā "to go away, pass away, be over, be in the past" as in the PIP of Labīd:

«tubakkī 'alā 'iθri ('a)š šabābi ('a)l laḏī madā...» (DL, p. 90, L. 2).

It also signifies "to advance, go or move forward, go to"; muḏwā'u or muḏyā'u "advance, going forward". The same sort of meaning is expressed in Egyp. by caus. s-ḏ' "to go, to depart; to die"; sḏ' "departure" (EHD II, 632, 716).

1) The same proot developed into three trilaterals in Sab. as follows:

1a) mḏ' "to go, proceed, march, reach a place; to proceed to do s.t.", caus. hmd' "pay over money" (for this meaning, see (3) below) also "put into effect, as an agreement" and "carry on ritual prescription" (SD, 89) = CA caus. 'amdā "to sign (e.g. an agreement, contract, etc.)" as in madā 'aḏdan, also in a sentence "carry on (e.g. pilgrimage)" as in 'amdā farīdata ('a)l ḥaḡḡi; madā "to go, proceed, march".

1b) mḏy "penetrating wound, deep" (SD, 84) = CA mādi-n, said of a sword, knife "with a sharp blade", said of a wound "penetrating"; madā'u "sharpness, keenness": Egyp. mḏ "deep" besides mḏ' "liturgy, document, book" (EHD I, 337).

1c) mḏw "to pay over money" (SD, 84) ~ hmd' above = CA CIV 'amdā occurs in *Hadith* "to (continue to) give for charity" = BHeb. himšī' (with preposition 'el), "to deliver, present", EHeb., JAram. mšwh "act of charity, donation" (NWSI II, 677).

2) PHS \*ḏa' "to go", as in Egyp. ḏ' "to travel, set out for a journey, cross a river in a boat", caus. s-ḏ' "to go, depart; die" (EHD II, 632, 894).

3) The proot is seen in all Semitic languages and also in Egyp. with prefixed w- (for this prefix, see §3.12 below), as in OAkk. wš' "to go out" (Gelb, 1961: 189), Assy. ašū "to come or go forth, send forth, let go, allow to escape, drive out" (King, 1898: 323), Ug. yš' "to go out" (UG, 533), OSA wḏ' "to go out, flow out", Eth. waḏ'a, BHeb. yāšā', Aram. ye'a "to go out" (Stehle, JAOS, Vol. 60, 1940: 517), Phoen. yš' "to go out, come out" (PG, 107), Ge. wāḏ'a ~ wāš'a "to go out", Har. waṭa'a, Tna. wāš, Amh., Arg., Gur. wāṭ(ṭ)a id. (HED, 162), Egyp. caus. s-wḏ' "to go, go forward" (EHD II, 654).

4) The proot is also seen in CA with prefixed negative \*'- as in 'āḏa "to come back, return".

4a) It is also seen with prefixed n- as in CA nadā "to travel through, cross", apparently = BHeb. nāšū in Lam 4, 15 "they flee away, wander" (OT, 687). The Egyp. cognate is ḏ' "to travel, set out on a journey" (EHD II, 894).

4b) Long after the establishment of \*mḏ- as a root, the prefix \*'- was first added to derive a causative form of the verb (cf. CA CIV 'amdā s.t. "to complete, accomplish"), but has later become part of the root, hence CA 'amīḏa "be resolute; strong"; 'amīḏu "mighty", i.e. (in Arabic) ḏū (= having) 'azīmah (= resolution) māḏīyah (firm). Its exact cognates in other Semitic languages are seen in Ug. 'mš "strong" (UG, 536), BHeb. 'amēš "be firm, active; to strengthen", etc.

4c) Gesenius (OT, 66) connects the BHeb. word in 4b above with CA 'abūšu "be active, fleet, of a horse". It seems that CA ['bš] is originally CIV of bāša "to outrun,

precede, surpass”, where \*ba is a proot (see §2.13 below).

5) There is a close relationship between “go out” and “expenditure, outlay” (see, for example, [npk] in §2.11.29 below), hence Semitic [wḏ'] derives into Akk. ṣītu “expenses”, Sab., Min. mwd' id., Eth. wḏ' “to spend money”, etc. (DRS VII, 596).

**2.10.26** Pun., OffAram. mhr “capable, efficient” (NWSI II, 602), BHeb. māhar “be skilled, apt, quick” (OT, 542), CA mahura “be skilled, skilful, apt, efficient”; māhiru “skilful, efficient”, Egyp. m'hr “be skilled, expert” (EHD I, 284): PHS word \*har- “hasten, be quick, prompt, apt” as in BHeb. māhar id., EHeb. mhrh, Palm. mhryt “quickly” (NWSI II, 602), CA harra “to hasten, move rapidly” also “go away, flee” like its Egyp. cognate hr “go away” (EHD I, 449).

**2.10.27** CA masīlu [msl] “flowing (of water), water course” is clearly from sāla “to flow (water)” + \*m- “place of”; sailu “a great flow of water, flood”, Sab. m-syl-t “wadi-bed, water course” (SD, 130), Chad.: Mokilko seelo “basin” (HSED, n. 2213): PHS [’il] “flood” (see [wbl] in §2.12.50 below).

**2.10.28** CA mataha “to wander, go astray”; ta-mattuhu “not knowing where to go, wandering about”, Tham. mt “lose one’s way” (Branden, 1950: 518), SL matāha-h “wilderness, where one loses one way” (CA matāha-tu id.), and its initial ma- is fully realized as being a prefix, meaning “place of *tawāh*”, i.e. tīh: CA tāha “to lose one’s way, to wander (of the mind); tīhu “desert, wilderness; empty” as in the PIP of A’sha:

«wa baidā’a tīhin yal’abu (’a)l’ālu fauḡahā...» (DA, p. 99, L. 4)

BHeb. [thh], obsol. “wasteness, desolateness; desert”: BAram. th’ “be waste, desolate, desert” (OT, 1096).

**2.10.29** māra [r. mwr], said of any liquid (water, tears, etc.), to flow or move with hesitation, i.e. *to stagger, go to and fro like the waves of the sea*, hence mauru = mauḡu in meaning = “waves”; ta-mūru, said of the sky, as in the Koran (52:9): *تمور السحاب مورا* (يوم), expresses, according to one account, “to reel”, and to another “move like waves”. The latter signification occurred in PIP. A’sha says:

«...mauru (’a)s-saḡābati lā raiḡun wa lā ’aḡalu», ...*(as) a cloud moving like waves neither dawdlingly nor hastily* (ṢHH II, 820; LA). The same sort of deep meaning is also expressed by the trilateral [myr] as in CIV ’amāra “to melt, pour, mix (= shake) with water”.

The trilateral [mwr/myr] is seen in Semitic languages with different significations.

1) Sab. [mwr/myr] “cereal crops, sale cereals” (SD, 89), in Aram., Akk. [mwr] “to buy” (NWSI II, 605), CA māra “to bring and sale foods”; mīra-tu “food”, etc. are either a compound of \*m- + -’r: CA māyiyya-tu *arch.* “wheat” (LA), Egyp. ym id. (EHD I, 50) or from \*’ar- in CA “to buy crops, etc.” as in Poet.:

«lā ya-ta-’arraw-na fī ’al maḡī...», *they do not collect food in strained conditions.*

What may strengthen the first choice is the presence of mūna-tu [mwn] “a stock of food collected in the Summer and stored for the Winter”.

2) In BHeb. *mwr* denotes “to change, alter” (OT, 549) = CA *māra* “be confused and reluctant + go + and then come back”. My choice of CA *māra* as a cognate form of BHeb. [*mwr*] is based solely on the semantic relationship between ‘*change*’ and the meaning expressed by *māra*: comp. CA *ḥāra* expresses the meanings of both CA *māra* and Heb. *mwr*. It is almost evident that *mwr* is a compound of \**maw* “a change” and [*ʾar*].

3) Sab. *mwr* “to besiege” (SD, 89) is cognate with either CA *mawru* “going around in a circle, revolving”, or from \**m-* “place” + \**ʾar-* in CA *ʾarra* “to fix, hold, to imprison” also “stay in a place, dwell in a place”, Egyp. *ʾr* “to put in restraint, shut up” (EHD I, 7).

4) Assy. *māru* denotes “to send” (King, 1898: 363) = CA *mauru* “flat trodden road, path”, so-called, according to LA [*r. mwr*], because *people go back and forth on it*, as in the PIP of Ṭarfah:

«... wa ʾatbaʾt waḏīfan waḏīfan fauḵa *maurin* muʾabbadi».

Sab. *mwr-t* “access way” (SD, 89). After rereading §3.10.8 above, one may note that the meanings of CA \**m-s-ʾr* and \**m-ʾr* have never developed into “to send” and remained “path, road”, i.e. *the place* (i.e. *ma-*) *where the meaning* (go, send, etc.) *connoted by the root takes place*.

5) The proot underlying Assy. and CA cognate triliters could be \**-r-* or \**ʾar-* “to go”. This same proot, I believe, is seen in Akk. *āru*, *wāru* “to go, depart, walk” (DRS VI, 483; HSED, 523) and in Assy. (ʾ)*āru*, which also denotes “to send” (King, op.cit: 324). It should be noted that both Assy. triliters also express “to rule, command; ruler”: Egyp. *wʾr* “depart, take to flight, escape” (EHD I, 156), in CA the root is [*wʾr*] as in CX *ʾistawʾara*, said of animals, “to run away”.

**2.10.30** Akk. *maʾdu* “many, big”, Ug. mid “much, large, big”, BHeb. *mēʾōd* “wealth; very”, CA CVIII *ʾimtaʾada* “acquire wealth” (Rabin, 1975: 88, n. 5, and p. 88, n. 53; UG, 534, 533), Assy. *maʾādu* “be numerous, many, much”. The trilateral is not in use in SL and it may be from either:

a) It is possible that the trilateral is from [*ʾad-*] “be much, many” as in CA *ʾadā* id.; *ʾādu* “strength, might” (= BHeb. *mēʾōd* “might”: cf. OT, 529); *ʾadiy*, said of a garment, “big, large” (= Akk.-Ug. *mʾd* “big” above); *ʾādā*, said of people, “to multiply in a place”. All such derivatives of CA [*ʾad*] are still insufficient to posit a stem [*ʾad*] as lying beneath Sem. [*mʾd*].

b) It is possible that the trilateral is from \**maʾ-* and that final /-d/ is from /-t/ (§2.9 above). This the stem in Sem. *māʾa-t* “one hundred”.

**2.10.31** CA *māša* [*mwš*] “to wash (clothes, etc.)”: *maušu* “washing”, LA quotes others as saying *māša* = *hāša* in meaning, but the dictionary does not include the word among its lexical entries, Har. *mēča* “to wash clothes”, Ć. Gt. *mečā-*, E., M *māčča-*, etc. are considered by Leslau (HED, 103) as borrowed from Cush.: Ga. *miču*, Kam. *meččeʾ*, Qab. *mečči-yoʾ*, Sid. *mačo*, *kambatta mečči-*, etc. Chad.: Musgum *masa*, *Masa musu-mo* “to wash” (HSED, n. 1748). To any analyst, the first radical /*m-*/ looks as a prefix having the same causative force as \**š-* and \**h-* in *hāšā* above: cf. also CA *šaušu* “washing”: *šāša* “to wash”.

To my understanding, however, \*m- has a different origin and so does \*w-š-. It is clear to me that māša developed from \*mawši'u, with /m-/ = place of", just like /m-/ in *mawḵifu* "place of standing" from waḵafa "to stand", *maktabu* "place of writing, i.e. office or desk" from kataba "to write"; and so forth. Hence \*mawši' = "place of watering", i.e. *of pouring water*, and is ultimately from mawḏi'u, i.e. *place of wuḏū* = "place of washing with pure water" = Phoen., EHeb., Samal, OffAram. mwš' "place of outflow" (NWSI II, 604), SA: Meh. wəṭōža', Jib. otža', əbtoža', Hars. ewtōzi "se laver avant la prière, accomplir les ablutions rituelles" (DRS VII, 596): 'adā-tu ~ 'idā-tu, pl. 'adā, 'adūn, etc. "rivulet, brook" (Al 'Ayn VII, 75): see §2.11.29, n. 10a below.

**2.10.32** BHeb. mā'al "to act covertly, treacherously, to be faithless"; ma'al "treachery against God, transgression, sin" (OT, 597), CA maḡala "to calumniate"; in *Hadith* maḡla-tu fem. = naḡla-tu fem. [r. nyl] = inner illness, i.e. rancor, grudge: ḡillu "rancor", ḡalīlu "grudge, rancor, fraud"; ḡāla [r. ḡwl] "to act treacherously", ḡaulu "treachery", ḡila-tu [r. ḡyl] "deception", etc.

a) A traditional derivative of [mɣl] is CA maḡla-tu, said of a sheep or she-goat, "giving birth to twin every year"; mumḡilu "sheep that gets pregnant while she has a suckling"; maḡlu "to suckle a baby and at the same time be pregnant", etc. see §2.11.29, n. 10b below. This is of course not a derivative of the root under study, but rather a derivative of [ḡal] "produce".

b) Phoen. m'l "above", JAram. m'l' id. (NWSI II, 670), BHeb. ma'al "the uppermost, upper part", adv. "above, over" is from Semitic \*'al- "above, up, high", and BHeb. mim'al "from above" is from the prepositional phrase in CA *min 'ali* "from above".

**2.10.33** BHeb. māṭal "to draw out, to make long" (OT, 560), CA maṭala "to stretch out, keep on putting off; dilate", with an underlying meaning "make long/tall" just like ṭauwala, etc. It is most obvious that the trilateral is a compound of a number of proots \*m- + \*ṭ-w + \*-l (see §§2.11.73 & 2.14.1 below). Another derivative of [mṭl] are mamṭūl, said of a man, lit. "tall (up) to the sky", i.e. *stretching from earth to sky* (MA, 377), maṭṭa [mṭ] "to stretch beyond the proper limit"

The same proot is also seen in CA maṭiya-tu fem. "a mount (e.g. a horse)"; CXIII 'imtaṭā "to mount or ride a horse"; CV tamaṭṭā "to stretch or spread one's limbs, as in yawning".

**2.10.34** Ge. mərəḡ, Tna., Te. mərṛaḡ, Amh., W., Z. mərəḡ, Arg. mərəc, Har. mərəḡ "spittle, saliva", etc. are, according to Leslau (HED, 111), from Semitic [wrḡ] as in BHeb. yāraḡ "to spit". The two trilaterals [mrḡ] and [wrḡ] are distant cognates and ultimately have developed from the same stem: cf. SL māṛū' (\*mārūḡ, unfound in CA) "filthy mixture of dung and water", BHeb. māṛāḡ ~ pārāḡ, CA maraḡu, maraḡa-tu "broth, soup" (OT, 619): PHS stem \*raḡ- as in BHeb. rāḡaḡ "to spit, spit out" (OT, 427, 998), CA ruḡḡu "shallow water"; riḡḡa-tu "a land whose water flows off", JAram., Syr., Mand. rḡḡ "spit" (MD, 437): cf. BHeb. rwḡ below also expresses "to empty", Akk. rāḡu "be empty"; rēḡu "empty", Mand. riḡna "empty", arḡ "to pour from one vessel to another" (MD, 38, 434). All are ultimately from a compound \*ra- + \*-ḡ- as in BHeb. rūḡ

“to pour out”, Samar. ʾārīk id., BAram. rwḵ “to spit” (OT, 972), OffAram. rwḵ “to spit” ~ rḵḵ id. (NWSI II, 1064), CA rāḵa [r. rwḵ] “be poured out (water)”; CIV ʾarāḵa “to pour out” ~ rāḵa [r. ryḵ] also strangely expresses a pass. meaning “be poured out (water)” (equivalent to CVII \*ʾinrāḵa); rīḵu “saliva”, Ge. rḵy “to sprinkle”, Chad.: Dera reke “moisten” (HSED, 447)

a) With \*-r- ext.: BHeb. rūr “to spit out”, CA rūru “saliva of infants”, Syr., BAram. ryr “saliva” (OT, 972), Akk. lēru, Mand. rira id. (MD, 434).

b) With \*-l- ext.: CA ruʾālu “saliva (of horse)”. All are based on [rā-] in CA rā “froth or spume of the sea or waves”.

c) CA maraḵa, said only of a bird, “to dung”. The most widely used CA verb expressing this notion with reference to birds is ḍaraḵa, this has become Leb. and other modern dialects zarraʾ “to urinate”, developed from the resemblance of “urination” to “bird’s excrement”, which is ‘watery feces’; also, SL zaraʾ “evacuate of water feces; diarrhea”, OAkk. zrḵ “to pour” (Gelb 1961: 178), BHeb. zāraḵ “to scatter, sprinkle”, often of things liquid, as water, Num. 19, 13; as blood, Ex. 24, 6. 29, etc. (OT, 289), OffAram. zrḵ “to sprinkle” (NWSI I, 342). It seems evident that [ḍrḵ] is a compound of \*ḍar- “to scatter” (see §2.1.12. n. 3 above) and \*-ḵ- “liquid”.

d) Like [ḍrḵ] is [ḍrp] “shed tears, sprinkle” (§2.3.34), a compound of [ḍar] and [-p], etc. Thus [-ḵ] and [-p] = two types of liquid/water<sup>129</sup>.

e) An Etymologically different [mrḵ] is seen in CA maraḵa “to pass rapidly” also as in *marāḵa fī (ʾa)l ʾarḍi* “to pass” in the sense “disappear (+ rapidly)”: marra “to pass”, BHeb. mārar “to flow” (OT, 619): Berb.: Ayr əmmər “to pass by”, Chad.: Miya mir-, Mbu mur- “to run”, Cush.: Sid., Hadiya, Kambatta, Bambala mar- “to go” (HSED, n., 1731), Eyp. mrt, mrrt “street” (RPAA, n. 593) = CA ma-marru “passageway, path”. I have already drawn attention that \*-ḵ in some trilaterals adds to the meaning of the biliteral the notion just discovered here. It is, to my understanding, the very same /-ḵ/ in Akk. birḵu, CA barḵu, etc. gen. Sem. “lightning”, etc. see §2.2.51, n. b, under *Comments* above.

**2.10.35** CA maʾaru [r. mʾr] “falling of hair”; maʾira “to fall (hair, feathers); CIV ʾamʾara, said of the earth, “become naked, droughty, with no trees or plants”; said of a person “become poor” = BHeb. maʾar [r. ʾrh] “nakedness; naked place” (OT, 601). The CA trilateral has developed from [ʾar-] as in ʾuryu “nakedness, nudity”; ʾuryā-nu ~ ʾāri-n “naked, nude, uncovered”; ʾarāʾu “open place, uncovered place, the outside”, ʾariya “be naked”, Phoen. ʾry “to strip off”, OAram. ʾrr “be denuded, be stripped”, OffAram. ʾrh “naked, stripped; lacking, devoid of, without” (NWSI II, 887, 890), BHeb. ʾūr [r. ʾwr] “be naked” ~ ʾārā [r. ʾrh] id. ~ ʾarār [r. ʾrr] “make oneself bare, be naked” (OT, 763, 815, 820).

**2.10.36** CA maʾīn (i.e. mʾyn) “apparent water-course” as in the Koran: (ذات قرار ومعين),

<sup>129</sup> A synonymous term is marayu [mrḡ] as in the proverb «ʾaḥmaḵu (= fool) mā (= not) yaḡʾā (he hides) marayah», lit. a fool (who does) not hide his saliva, is from {\*-ra-γ-} with /m-/ being a pp. prefix: ray(a)wa-tu “foam, froth, spume” as a vb rayā.

*secure and watered with springs* [speaking of a high land] (23: 50) = Moab., OAram. m'yn “spring, source” (NWSI II, 669). The trilateral is plainly from [m-] “place” and [ʾyn] “spring, source of water, well” as in CA ʾain id., Ug. ʾn “spring, well” (UG, 636, 537). Harawi reports that Thaʿlab said: ʾāna, said of water, “to flow in a way apparent to view” as opposed to γāʾir<sup>130</sup> in the following verse of poetry:

«...ṭāmin ya-ʾīnu wa γāʾir-in masdūmu» (LA, r. mʾn).

This is also the real meaning of vb maʾana.

**2.10.37** CA mudḡu coll. “fish”: EHeb. dg, pl. dgym “fish”, JAram. dgʾ id. (NWSI I, 240), Ug. dg id.

**2.10.38** CA maḡā [mḡy/-w] expresses two root meanings:

i) maḡā “to burnish, make shine, clean (e.g. a sword)”, from \*-ḡ- (see §2.11.51 above).

ii) The homophonous trilateral [mḡw] is of a different origin, preserved in the proverb «(ʾi)mḡu hāḡā maḡwa-ka māli-k!» (ML V, 341), where the imper. /-mḡu/ expresses “protect, safeguard!” = imper. ḡi! id. as in ḡi-nā! *protect-us!*: waḡā “to protect”, Akk. (a)ḡū, Ug. yḡy, etc. id. (DRS VII, 605). One significant semantic change has been noted in *māl* (in *māli-k* above), orig. meant “cattle”, now expressing “money”.

**2.10.39** CA [mḡd] has two derivatives formed from two different roots:

i) maḡdu “sucking” is from maḡṣu id. It seems that -d is from an orig. -t, and the earlier form is \*maḡ-tu from maḡṣa-tu “sucking” = maḡḡa-tu id.

ii) muḡdā-nu pl. “top of mountain” is from ṣaddu “mountain”.

**2.10.40** HS [mʾn] has a number of different origins. Among them are:

a) Sem. [mʾn] “to refuse”, where [m-] is a proot signifying “not”: see §2.21.4.1 below.

b) CA maʾana “to know, learn”; maʾanna-tu fem. “sign or mark of knowledge, manifestation of”, i.e. *a sign that tells, makes one know*. (see LA, r. ʾnn & r. mʾn). The trilateral could be from the noun \*maʾnu “seeing”, from [ʾn] “to see” (§2.8.22 above), or much more likely from a proot [maʾ] “to know; see” as in Egyp. mʾ “to see, perceive”; m “to see, to grasp” (EHD II, 266): §2.3.6-8 above.

**2.10.41** CA maḡaya “to chew” < ḡayḡaya id, and with various extensions, each creating a new trilateral: ḡayḡaya “to chew with the upper and lower jaws (due to loss of teeth)”, ḡayata “to chew with canine and molar teeth”, ḡayaṭa “to squeeze out, to press”, ḡaylu “the noise or sound produced as one sucks from the (small) opening of a drinking vessel” as a vb ḡayala, ḡayada (~ zaḡada) lit. “squeeze out the palate or throat”, ḡayaṭa<sup>131</sup> “to press with the hand”, ḡayanu, said of a camel's chest, “pressing upon, crushing by its

<sup>130</sup> It is most likely that γʾr is a compound of γā- “down, under” and [ʾir-] “stream, water”. This is the same γā seen in trilaterals like γāṣa “dive, submerge, i.e. *under water*”: [ṣā] ~ [ḡā] “water”, see §2.11.29 below.

<sup>131</sup> The word is plainly a compound of stem [ḡay] and proot [ṭa-] “hand”, which is seen in numerous traditional roots: see §2.17.32 below.

chest", ḏayama "to bite", etc. Possible cognates are Akk. ṣahut- "extract oil", Chad.: Kera čeete "to squeeze", Pero čotto "to press, squeeze out" (HSED, n. 499).

**2.10.42** CA maḏḏā'u [mḏ'] "one who does not keep a secret, liar" (ML V, 309) is evidently from ḏā'a "spread news".

**2.10.43** Chad.: Tumak māg "much, many", Musgoy mogwa "big, high, long", Cush.: Saho meg "be numerous"; many, "be strong", Afar mag "be numerous" (HSED, n. 1704). All are perh. from PHS \*ga' "many, much, great, etc.", seen with caus. /š-/ in related languages (§2.2.29, esp. 1b above).

**2.10.44** CA masā "to delay, linger", *not to fulfill a promise*, a compound of prep. [ma] "at" and proot [sa'] "back, behind" = Eyp. m s' "at the back of, after, behind" (II, 265): see §2.1.6.9, n. 1m above.

The same idea can also be expressed by nasa'a "to delay, linger"; CIV 'ansa'a, with prep. 'an, "be behind and far"; CIV nāsā (< \*nāsa'a) "place at a distance, send away", nas'u "late, delay", with prefixed b- becoming a part of the root [bns]: bannasa "be late". For proot [b-], see §2.13 below.

Trilateral [ns'] includes a proot *sa'* plus a prep. *na* "in, on, by" = Akk. ina "in, on, from, by", etc. see §2.11, n. 7 below.

**2.10.45** CA mas'a "mid, middle (of a road)": sawā' "middle, mid".

**2.10.46** CA ma'ḡu "salty water" < 'aḡāḡu (said of water) "salty, bitter". Here also belongs CA mā'iḡu "having waves (sea)"; mauḡu is the most common word for "waves", BHeb. mūḡ "to melt, flow down" (OT, 544). The trilateral is a compound of CA ma' "water" and \*'aḡ- "salty".

**2.10.47** CA ma'ada "to go far"; mu-ta-ma-'di-du "far"; ma'du "fast" < PHS stem [ʾad] as in CA 'adā "to run" with 'adā'u "far", BHeb. 'adah "to pass, pass over", Phoen. 'dy "to advance" (PG, 131), etc.

**2.10.48** OffAram. mgr "to overthrow" (NWSI II, 594), BHeb. mgr "to cast before, deliver over, hurl (to the ground)", BAram. mgr "to cast down, overthrow", Syr. mgr "to fall" (OT, 535; Ryder, 1974: 103), CA maḡara, said of a pregnant sheep, "to lose weight and become ill so that it cannot move". For the origin of this trilateral, see §2.2.28 above.

**2.10.49** ma'ḡu "rapidity": ma'aḡa "hasten, speed up".

A stem [ʾaḡ] expresses "haste, rapidity" is seen in HS as in Tham. wg "aller vite", Chad.: Ndam. wuga "courir": CA waḡḡu "haste, rapidity, speed", hence wuḡuḡu pl. "fast or rapid ostrich (or sand-grouse?)" as in the PIP of Ṭarfah:

«wa mašat baina (ʾal) ḥašāyā mašya waḡḡu» (LA).

All seem to be from the root in CA 'aḡḡa "to hurry, hasten". It seems that *waḡḡu* in the line of Poet. above is a variant of wazzu pl. of wazza-tu "goose" (gen. Sem. id.). For



stem [ʿag]: see §2.11, n. 6b below. As to [mʿġ], it is a compound of proot [m] + proot [ʿ-], for this proot, see §2.14 below, + stem [ʿag].

**2.10.50** CA maʿduba-tu [r. ʿdb] “lunch or dinner party, usu. *attended by a lot of people*”. It shares with māʿida-tu (§2.10.20 above) a proot \*ʿad “eat”. Another derivative of the same proot is ʿadamu “meat as *food*, eating bread and meat” (MA, 22; LA).

1) A different trilateral [ʿdb] is seen in BHeb. [ʿdbl] “miracle of God”, a compound of ʿdb “miracle” and ʾl “God” (OT, 12) = CA ʿidbu “miracle” (MA, 21; LA), which is derived, according to Bin Faris (ML I, 75), from “gathering of people, crowded with people”.

Before closing this section, it should be made clear that final \*-b in [ʿdb] is definitely a proot, and that ʿidbu “miracle” is unquestionably based on ʾid- “miracle”, i.e. *a bad or good event unexplainable by the laws of nature*. It occurred in the Koran in the bad sense as in (لقد جئتم شيئا إدا), *Indeed you have put forth a thing most monstrous* (19: 89). The deep meaning of the word, however, is “very unusual or very great event or thing” as in Poet.:

«yā ʿummanā rakibtu ʿamran ʿiddā... (LA).

2) It seems that [ʾid] and [ʾit] as in EHeb. ʾt “signal, miracle” are ultimately variants of the same morpheme.

**2.10.51** CA maḥḥa “to eradicate”: see §2.2.10 above.

## 2.11 PHS PREFIXED /n-/

As a prefix, *n-* is used to form a stem denoting the reflexive and passive meaning as in Akk. *naprusu* “be separated”, etc. Nouns and adjectives are also formed from this stem as in Akk. *namungatu* “paralysis”, *nalbubu* “enraged”, Ug. *nblat* “flames” (Moscatti, 1969: 81-82), CA *’i-nhifādu* “lowering” (*’i-nhafāda* “be lowered”: *hafāda* “to lower”), *’inhiyāru* “collapse” (*’inhāra* “be collapsed”, said of s.t. *high or located in a high place*, hence Sem. *hr* “mountain, etc.”).

1) As a suffix, MSA uses a suffix */-n/* to derive verbs expressing a causative signification from substances e.g. *šarī’a-tu*, *šar’u* “religious law” > *šar’ana* “make lawful”. The same suffix is also common with the meaning “to act, or behave like”, e.g. *ḥimāru* “donkey” > *ta-ḥamrana* “to act like a donkey” > subst. *ḥamrana-tu* “stupidity, i.e. *acting like a donkey*”. This causative *-n* comes from Semitic */-n/*, originally forming nouns from verbs, later verbs from nouns, e.g. CA CIV *’abraha* [r. *brh*] “to show, prove” (= Akk. *barū* “to look at, inspect”: cf. AG, 69); CA *burhānu* “proof, evidence” > *barhana* “to prove”; pass. *burhina* “be proved”, Sab. *brhn* “testimony” also as a verb “be testified” (SD, 31). Another illustrative example is CA *sallaṭa* “to empower, dominate” > *sultānu* “power, control, authority, Sultan” > *saṭṭana* “to proclaim someone Sultan” = OffAram., Palm., Pun. *šlṭn*, etc. “power, control”: gen. Sem. [šlṭ].

For this prefix in Egypt., see (§2.1.14.1, n. 3 under *Comments* above). The prefix appears in Cushitic as a suffix as in Som. *dil* “to kill” > *dil-n* “be killed”, a suffix *-r* as in Bil. *alib* “to spy” > *alib-r* “to act as a spy”, or a prefix *m-* as in Bed. *dir* “to kill” > *m-dedār* “kill one another”; in Berber as *m-* as in Shil. *nag* “to kill” > *mnag* “to fight one another”, Kab. *zenz* “to sell” > *mzenz* “to sell one another”, Tamasheq *ekš* “to eat” > *m-ekša*; in Housa as *m-* as in *nag* “to kill” > *mnag* “to fight”, etc. (Barton, 1934: 23-24, n. 8).

2) The affix */n/* is also a very common infix and suffix in Semitic. Old Arab scholars finds that the affix */n/* can occur in any position: in the 1<sup>st</sup> position as in *na’ṭalu*, in 2<sup>nd</sup> as in *’ansalu*, *ḥunbaru*, *ḡindabu*, in 3<sup>rd</sup> as in *ḳalansuwa-tu*, *’aḳanḳalu*, in 4<sup>th</sup> as in *ra’šanu* and *bilyanu*, in 5<sup>th</sup> as in *ṣalatān* (*-ā-* here = /’/ or Alef), and 6<sup>th</sup> as in *za’farānu* (Tha’alibi, FL, p. 325, §50; Sibawayhi’s *Kitab* II, 326-327, 350ff).

3) Returning to suffixed */-n/*, many Semitic trilaterals show the following phenomenon when their third radical is */-n/*. The */n-/* is clearly a suffix used to modify the meaning. Accordingly, its presence in the root, absence, or transference to another position does not make any important difference in meaning. In some cases, the same phenomenon applies to initial */n/*.

3a) CA *ḳafanna* “nape of the neck, the back” and without *-n*: *ḳafā id.* = Berb. *eḳəf* “Kopf”, Chad.: Jegu *kofo* “Hinterkopf, Gehirn” (Müller, 1975: 64, n. 8).

3b) CA *’aṭana* “to damage, devastate, corrupt” = *’aṭā*, *’āṭa id.*

3c) CA *šāfa* “to see, look”, but *šafana* “to look at, squint”. One of the basic

differences between the two verbs is that the former is trans., e.g. *šāfa Ali* “He saw Ali”, whereas the latter is intrans., e.g. *šafana ’ila Ali* “He looked at Ali”. Akḥṭal, the Ummayyad poet, says:

«wa ’iḏā šafanna ’ila (’a)ṭ ṭarīki ra’aytahu...» (LA).

One may shift the radical /-n-/ to medial position to get another trilateral *šanifa*, expressing the same sort of meaning.

3d) Another example is HS [byn] as in CA bayya or bayyana “to show, make clear”; bāna “become apparent, manifest, clear” (for its cognates, see §2.13.24, n. 5a below). One may note here a surface fact that we can express a caus. meaning by either repeating the 2<sup>nd</sup> radical {bayya} or suffixing /-n/. The real fact, however, is that the origin of this /-n/ is to form a noun *bayānu* “manifest, clearance, opening to view” from vb bayya. At a later stage (a stage much older than that of sulṭānu “Sultan” > salṭāna “make Sultan” and burhānu “evidence” > barhana “to prove” above), /-n/ became a part of the root and a new root [byn] came into existence not only in CA, but also in nearly all HS language divisions as in Chad \*ban “uncover, open” as in Housa banye id., Mofu baṇ, Kera biṇi “to open”, Cush.: bana id., etc. §2.13.24, n. 5a below.

3e) CA naḏā “become emaciated”; CIV ’andā “make emaciated, emaciate”, said of a garment, clothes “to wear out”. One can shift the radical /-n-/ to the 2<sup>nd</sup> position and say ’adnā [ḏny], without any difference in meaning: PHS \*ḏW- (see §2.6.13, n. 10-11 above).

3f) Sab. ’wn “to help, protect”; s’t’n “to seek help” = CA CX ’ista’āna id.; ’āna “to help s.o.”: ’aw- in ta-’āw-ū = ta-’āwan-ū recip. “they help each other”.

3g) An interesting example is Semitic [rhn], whose underlying biliteral is impossible to discover without evidence from SL, as in OffAram., Nab. rhn “to mortgage, to give as a pledge” (NWSI II, 1062), Sab. rhn “to give pledges” (SD, 116), CA rahana “to mortgage”. SL rahan “to mortgage”, but is definitely from raha “give up (usu. something you possess), relinquish”, e.g. *raha bi baitu* (from baitihi *his house*) “He gave up his house”, *mā bi-rhi fih* “I don’t abandon him”: lit. “not (= mā) I abandon (= -rhi, from \*’arhi, and /bi-/ functioning like “am” and thus etymologically quite different from HS preposition bi “by, in, etc.”) him (fih: fī “in”, -h “him”). It is interesting to note that /-d/ can be suffixed to raha creating a new root \*rhd, but that the trilateral is meaningless without suffixed /-n/ as an inseparable part of it as in this negative sentence *mā tit-rahdan* may render “don’t be careless (about s.t. you own)”.

3h) Another example is [whn] as in Min. whn “être affaibli”, Jib. oṭhən “devenir mauvais”, šāhənt “mauvaise femme” (DRS VI, 511), CA wahuna “be weak, feeble, faint, to lose strength”; wahana, CIV ’awhana “to enfeeble, weaken”; wahanu “feebleness, faintness”. All have developed from [wah] as in CA wahā “be weak, feeble, faint”; CIV ’awhā “to weaken, enfeeble”; wāhin *alas!*, Te. wah “détruire”, in Ge. wāhəy “soir” (= CA wahuna “être au milieu, au plus intense, de la nuit”)<sup>132</sup>: cf. DRS VI, 510-511.

<sup>132</sup> The question whether [whn] is a blend of [wh] and [wn] remains open to discussion: cf. CA wānā “languor, lassitude, tiredness”; CA wanā “be tired, feeble, weak; to lose vigor”; tawānā “to delay, tarry, be lazy; delay”; Sab. hwny caus. “dépérir”, Ge. tawannaya, tawānaya “jouer, s’amuser” (DRS VII, 562), BHeb. ’wn “toil, trouble, calamity” (OT, 23).

3i) Akk. e-dá-nu “term” (AG, 72), OArām. ‘dn “time” (Rosenthal, AG, 13), etc. (\*-n is part of root) = CA ‘iddā-nu “time, term, fixed time” (\*-n is a suffix): ‘adda “to count, reckon”; ‘idda-tu “several, group”; ‘adīdu “many, number (of)”; ‘idādu “once”, also SL ‘addeh, said only of bread (loaf), “dozen”, etc. However, the trilateral [‘dn] exists in CA as in ‘addānu “seven years” = SL ‘addīn (with imāla of /ā/ to /ī/) “seven years”, in the speech of old people, and also “term”, exactly like that of Akk.

3j) CA ta-sfinu, said of the wind, “to blow the dust”: safā id. (§2.2.30 above).

4) In Egypt., too, suffixed -n is easy to distinguish from the root; its prefixed /n-/ has already been dealt with in §2.1.14.1, n. 3 above. Some additional examples are:

4a) dhn “to hide, cover over” < dh “to hide” (EHD II, 887).

4b) šbn “to be mixed, to mix together” < šb “to mix, to prepare drink” (EHD II, 735-736).

4c) θhn “to advance, to meet, to touch” < θh “to approach, invade”; θh-t “approach” (EHD II, 858).

4d) bhñ “to slay, to cut in pieces, to stab, to pierce” < bh “to cut, to kill, to hack”; bh’ “to tear or break in pieces” (EHD I, 220).

4e) swñ, sw’n “to know” < s’, sy’ “to know” (EHD II, 633, 649, 650).

4f) One may also comp. Egypt. s’, sw’n “to know” above with its CA cognate ya’isa id. (§2.6.8 above), etc. In the light of such Egypt. examples, it seems that this particular /-n/ was once used to form *the infinitive*.

5) A very important fact should be taken into account is that CA /-n/ as a suffix could be a prep. as in ḏaifanu “one who comes with the guest”: ḏaifu “guest” [ḏyf] = SA: Meh. ḏayf id., Jib. eḏef “give hospitality”, Chad.: Pero miḏiva “guest”, Sura mizep “stranger, pilgrim”, Krk šapa “friend” (HSED, n. 584). This particular /-n/ was rightly considered by most grammarians as a suffix (LA), though Sibawaihi wrongly treated as a part of [ḏfn]. It is possible, however, that final /-n/ here is a sort of case ending or a preposition (but, see n. 7 below), and that it could be related to Cush. ne-, -ne, -nā “with; and”, Chad. naa “with” (RPAA, n. 608).

6) An equally important fact is the presence of a prefixed /n-/ in Hamito-Semitic, which is quite different from the reflex. and pass. homophone /n-/ in *function, distribution, and meaning*. This particular /n-/ is a bound morpheme orig. prefixed to substances (n. & adj.), and is seen in Egypt. as [n’], e.g. n’š “many”: ‘š “many, much, numerous”, n’‘n “beautiful”: ‘n “beautiful”, etc. As one may note from such examples, it is hard to identify the type of meaning it adds to the word to which it is attached. However, the signification of this morpheme is clear only in CA. Examples are:

6a) ‘aḡīḡ “making a loud cry or sound” as a vb ‘aḡḡa as in Poet.

«ya’iḡḡu ‘aḡīḡa (’a)l raḥli lamma taḥṣassarat...» (LA).

A combination of [na’] and [’aḡ] yields a trilateral [n’ḡ] as in na’ ‘aḡu نأ، said of a bull, expresses lit. “much + meaning of ‘aḡīḡ above (LA).

6b) ‘aḡḡu “fast, quick”; ‘aḡḡa “hasten, hurry” as in Poet.

«sadā bi yadayhi θumma ‘aḡḡa bisayrihi

ka-’aġġi ’addalīm min ẓanīšin wa kālibi» (LA).

Prefixing [na’] to [’aġ] yields na’’āġu نَاج “fast, quick”; na’ġu “speed, rapidity”. From other examples cited in LA to illustrate [n’ġ], we conclude that [na’] expresses ‘an intensive meaning’, i.e. “very, so, too”, as in na’ġa the wind... lit. “the wind passes so fast...”.

The later fate of /-’/ of [na’] in HS is similar to any proot ending with this radical like caus. [da’], etc. It has often been dropped in combinations with other roots, e.g. CA na’du in §2.11.1 below is a noun, while the adjective is na’ādu ~ na’ūdu, both are from \*na’’ād- and \*na’’ūd- respectively: comp. na’’āġu above. A similar, though not identical, reduction is seen in CIV stems as in [’kl]: ’a’kulu > ’ākulu “I eat”. The root radical /’-/ is also dropped in *imper. arch.* ’u’kul! > kul!

7) [n-], like [m] above, may be a particle functioning as a prep. as in Egyp. n “for, to, on account of; in”, neg. “no, not”, CA n-, -n, etc. (e.g. see §§2.12.16, under *Comments* and 2.21.3 below).

8) In many cases, the orig. function of prefixed [n-] is to derive a subst. from the verb or from another subst. as, for example, CA naḏlu n. or adj. “coward, mean, contemptible”: ḏullu n. “meanness, abasement”; adj. ḏalīlu; as a vb ḏalla, BHeb. zll “be abject, vile, despised”, in Syr. “be vile” (OT, 280), etc. see §2.11.67, 2.11, 77, 2.11.79, 2.11.87, etc. below.

9) Final [-n] or [-nw] is used to form the ordinal numbers, esp. in Egyp., as in *fdw-nw* “fourth” (*fdw* “four”), *mt-nw* “tenth” (*mt* “ten”).

**2.11.1** CA na’ādu “calamity” and with suffixed -l: na’dilu id. < ’ādu, ’iddu “atrociousness and calamity”: PHS stem [’ad-] “malady” as in Egyp. ’d “calamity; heart disease”; ’dī “be afflicted, wounded” (EHD I, 14) = CA ma-’āwīdu pl. “calamity”. Here also belongs Akk. adū “maladie” (DRS I, 8). To this proot ultimately belongs CA ’awdā CIV [r. wdy] “be dead, perished” (?) ~ CV tawadda’a [r. wd’] id.

I believe that all trilaterals cited above and many others have developed in the course of time from a proot \*dau- “malady, illness” as in Akk. di’ “maladie grave”, Ug. dw “être malade”; mdw “maladie”, EHeb. dwh “malade”, CA dā’ “maladie”, Tham. dy “être malade”, etc. (DRS I, 231).

**2.11.2** Akk. napāšu “to shake out”, OffAram. npš “to press, crush” (NWSI II, 741), BHeb. npš “to break or dash in pieces” also “to disperse, scatter”; nepeš “inundation, storm, violent rain”, Eth. nfš “be scattered”, Aram. napaš “excursit, dispersit, effudit” (OT, 683-684), Mand. npš “to shake off, move off, shake out, toss out”, Syr. npš “to disperse, shake out” (MD, 303), CA nafaḏa, naffaḏa “to shake out” also “to shake off (a dress to free it from dust, a tree to make its fruit fall, etc.)”; nuffādu, nafḏu “fallen (and scattered) leaves, fruits, dates”, under and around a tree, palm-tree: PHS stem \*paḏ- as in CA faḏḏa “to break and scatter”, hence fuḏāḏā “scattered fragments of a broken thing” as in the PIP of Nabīyah:

«yaṭīru *fudādan* bainahā kullu ḵaunasin

wa yatba'uhā minhum farāšu (ʾa)l ḵawāḡibi» (DN, p. 17, L. 6).

CV tafāda, CVII 'infadda “be scattered, dispersed”, SL fadd, said of clothes, “soak in water and shake them off to free them from water” also (as in CA fadda) “to break open, deflower, scatter”. The former meaning of dial. *fadd* contains two semantic units: *water* (on the clothes or on anything) + *shake them off* = CA nafāda [r. nfd] in the PIP of Ubaid Bin Abraṣ:

«fa *naḵada-t* rīṣahā wa walla-t...» (ŠM, p. 109, L. 44), where *naḵada-t* (-t refers back to a bird) “shook off its feathers (or wings) to get rid of *snow* or *ice* (i.e. *ḵarību* in a preceding line) covering them. This meaning can extend to “wipe off, clean” as in CA CII naffāda “wipe off (e.g. table, etc.), i.e. *free from whatever on it, as of dust*”, SL naffad “to wipe off” > ‘clean’, fadd, said of clothes, “to wash”, e. g. *free* (~ empty)<sup>133</sup> *them of dirt, spots*, and the like, hence Chad.: Tangale puḍe “to clean, wash”, Sura, Angas fet “to sweep”, Gudu mi-fīda id., Cush.: Sid. fiṭ- “to sweep”, Ometo fit- id., Iraqw, Alagwa fi “to sweep” (HSED, n. 796, 842).

The word \*paḍ- is also seen with caus. \*ṣ- in Assyr. ṣapaṣu “to spread out”.

**2.11.3** BHeb. nepeṣ “violent rain”, etc. above (§2.11.2), Aram. napaṣ “to pour out” (OT, 683-684): CA faidu “inundation, flood, copious water”: fāda “to overflow (water)”; BHeb. pwṣ “to overflow, be superabundant, of fountains” (OT, 839). As in nearly all other cases, the semivowel may assimilate completely to its neighboring \*-ḏ, hence CA fadda “to pour out”; faḏīdu “scattered water”; faḏadu “scattered” (LA).

It should be noted that BHeb. [pwṣ], just like [npṣ] (§2.11.2 above), also expresses “to break or dash in pieces” as well as “to scatter, disperse”, CA fāda, CX 'istafāda “be spread out, be dispersed, be superabundant”.

A distinction should be made between [npḏ I] “shake” and [npḏ II] “pour out”.

**2.11.4** Sab. n'd “luxuriant crops, luxuriance” (SD, 93) = CA na'da “to give forth water”, i.e. *the earth*; whence na'du “a land yielding water”.

a) Another closely related trilateral is [m'd], seen in CA ma'du “graceful and tender plants, growing profusely (plants)”: ma'ada “to give forth water (the earth), to live in luxury”, derived from the notion “be irrigated, watered”.

b) Both trilaterals are ultimately from a proot \*Wad- or \*Wid- expressing *a special type of water*. The proot is seen in many compounds, one of which is CA 'iddu<sup>134</sup> (< 'a'-wid) “copious (earth) water”, i.e. *coming out or sourcing from the earth as opposed to kara', which comes from the rain*, BHeb. 'ēd “flot souterrain”, according to Cohen (DRS I, 8), but “vapour, mist, rising from the earth and forming clouds”, according to Gesenius (OT, 12). Other cognates are Akk. edū “inundation”, BAram. 'yd “vapour”. Cohen (ibid.), following some Semitists, wrongly claims that:

<sup>133</sup> The widely used term form ‘empty’ is fādī, as a vb faddā.

<sup>134</sup> The word could be a compound of [ʾ-] “copious, large amount” and 'id “water”. Combining the two proots results, as usual, in the loss of a syllable and in regressive assim. of /-ʾ-/ , i.e. becoming \*-d-. For proot [ʾ], see §2.14 below and see §2.11.15, n. 2 below.

*«La forme Akk. est dérivée du Sum(erian) et semble à l'origine de la form heb. de sens douteux».*

This view, like any other view proposed by a Semitist, is purely groundless. To this native PHS word also belong, among numerous other trilaterals, Egyp. y'd "dew, mist, vapor; exudation", yd "dew" (EHD I, 27, 101), Berb.: Ahg ədu "to soak", Chad.: Sura dō "to pour", Angas dō id., Kry dā "be wet", Jmb da'ā id., Cush.: Som. da' "rain", Agaw \*du- "to pour" (HSED, n. 594) , with prefixed /n-/: CA nadā "be moist; dew"; nadwa-tu "place of drinking" (MA, 388; LA), Sab. ynd' "make flow" (SD, 91).

c) For what concerns the variant \*wad- "water", CA wadā "to flow, pour forth", Sab. wdy "to flow"; v. imp. p. ydynn "water a place" (SD, 156), SAR wdy "couler; fleuve; cours d'eau", Meh., Hars. ḥə-wōdi "cours d'eau, vallée" also Sab. wdy-n "valley" = CA wādi-n "vallée, lit de rivière, cours d'eau" (DRS VI, 500). It also seems to belong here with suffixed /-n/ or prefixed /w-/ Sab. dyn "irrigated field" (SD, 37) = Sab. wdn "to irrigate, prepare fields for flood-irrigation"; stwdn "be flood-irrigated", CA wadana "to wet, soak in water, moisten"; CX (')stwdn is rare; pp. mawdūn "soaked in water, being wet, moisten".

d) On BHeb. [n'd] Gesenius (OT, 636-637) states:

*«BHeb. בִּנְיָן m., pl. בִּנְיָנִים, "a bottle", i.e. a skin or leathern sack for milk Judg. 4, 19; or for wine 1 Sam. 16.20. Josh. 9, 4. 13. The skins for preserving wine were suspended in the smoke, Ps. 119, 83. –So called either as being used for liquids; or better, from being shaken in order to make butter from milk».*

The BHeb. word is from the root in CA 'idāwa-tu "a small leathern or hide sack for milk or water used primarily for churning milk", i.e. *to make butter-milk from milk*; 'adā is the verbal form; 'idā'u is the term for the a special thread used to tie the opening of this particular sack, and it occurred in *Hadith* (LA, r. 'dy).

**2.11.5** CA nu'rūru "smoke of fat" < 'ira-tu "hump fat" also "heat of fire": 'array-tu "I flame up a fire" is from warray-tu id., according to Abu Zayd (in LA, r. 'ry). Besides, we have 'irra-tu fem. [r] "fire", 'uwāru (r. 'wr) "heat (of fire, sun), smoke, flame", and 'ira-tu (r. w'r) also "hump fat, fire, pit for fire"; 'uwāru "heat", all are from PHS stem \*wur- "fire". For the origin of \*wr-, see §2.17.1 below.

**2.11.6** Akk. nadū "to pay, cast a judgment" (AG, 90), CA nadiya "to grant, give (out of generosity)"; tanaddā "be generous or open-handed in giving"; nadā "generosity, giving" MA, 388; LA) as in the PIP of Antarah:

*«wa 'idā ṣaḥautu falā 'uqaṣṣiru 'an nadan...» (Š & Š, p. 363, L. 57).*

1) Akk. nadānu "to give, pay" (AG, 89), Assy. nadānu "to give, deliver, grant" (King, 1898: 367): PHS \*daW- as in CA CIV 'addā [r. 'dy] "to give, hand, deliver", Sab. 'dw "to give, grant" (SD, 2). To this PHS stem belongs CA [r. dyn] as in dāna "to give on credit"; dainu "loan, debt". The following facts should be noted:

1a) Final -n of Akk. [ndn] and CA [dyn] is also seen in OAram. ntn "to give" (Rosenthal, AG, 12), BHeb., BAram., Syr. ntn id. (OT, 703), OffAram., Palm., JAram., Nab. ntn "to give", Hatra ntyn "generous" (NWSI II, 766f), Tham. ntn "to give"; mtyn

“giving, gift” (Branden, 1950: 516), Phoen., Mand. ntn “to give” (MD, 307). It is also seen in Phoen., Ug. ytn, etc. below.

1b) In both Akk. [ndn] and CA [ndy], initial -n is a reflex. caus. prefix, meaning “causing oneself to”. The same prefix is also seen in BHeb.-Aram. [ntn] above. As for final \*-n of all trilaterals, it is most likely a preposition signifying “to” = Egyp. /n/ in rdī n “give to”.

2) We may tentatively establish two stems, one is \*daW- “to give” (Akk., CA) and the other is \*taW- “to give” (Aram., Heb), and put them to test to see whether they are factual root or not.

The real test is to take some other permissible prefixes or proots and add them to \*dW- and \*tW. If the resulting combinations express the same sort of meaning denoted by \*dW- and \*tW-, then our analysis is correct. Otherwise, it is simply wrong.

*TEST I.* By adding /ʾ-/ , forming CA IV verbs in CA, to \*daW-, we get CA ʾaddā above, Sab. ʾdw “to give, grant” above, Egyp. yd’ “to grant, give” (EHD I, 102), Akk. idū “rent(al)”, Syr. adi “to bring (in)”, Ge. ʾada “debt” (like CA dy-n above), Amh. ada id. (DRS I, 8).

*TEST III.* By adding \*/š-/ , a caus. prefix, to \*daW-, we get CA sadā, CIV ʾasdā “to give”, esp. *an advice or service*. The meaning of the verb should neither be confused with “to advise”, which is expressed in CA by naṣaḥa, nor with “to serve”, which is expressed by ḥadama. The verb also expresses “to confer upon, give (e.g. a benefit)”. The original lexical meaning of sadā, however, is “(stretch) the hand toward” (Al ʾAyn VII, 280; ML III, 150; ṢḤḤ VI, 2374; LA).

*TEST IV.* By adding m- to \*daW-, we get CA māda, CIV ʾamaddā “to give”; mīdā “given” (§2.10.20 above).

*TEST V.* By adding /y-/ , a caus. prefix in Phoen., to \*taW-, we get Ug. ytn “to give”; itn “gift” (UG, 533), Phoen., Pun. ytn id. (NWSI II, 478-479), perh. Egyp. wdn ~ wtn “to make an offering; offering, gift” (EHD I, 189, 191).

We may reconstruct PHS stems \*daW- ~ \*taW- “to give” as in Egyp. d ~ t, dw, d’, dī “to give” (EHD II, 815, 864ff; EG: §289).

3) Egyp. also has rdī “to give”. On Egyp. dī and rdī, Gardiner (ibid.) writes:

*«The view that rdī/dī is a single root which early suffered from the loss of both its first and its third consonant in certain forms seems preferable to the view that rdī and dī are two distinct verbs obscurely related in their origin».*

The fact is that both Egyp. verbs are derived from one single proot \*dW-, and that the Egyp. initial \*r- is a grammatical prefix, having the same function as CA \*r-. The meaning of this grammatical suffix is *reflexive, reflexive causative, or purely passive* as in CA ṣamma “to smell”; CV taṣammama = raṣama = “make oneself smell (the food)”. An identical example is ratama, usu. used in a negative sentence: mā ratama = mā



takallama (CV of klm “speak”), lit. “not make oneself speak”: *tamtama* “to mutter”. These examples show clearly that [r-] is similar to (though not identical with) [t-] of CV.

The fact to be stressed is that Egyp. {dī/rdī} is not an isolated instance in the language, and that the language has other similar pairs of roots, i.e. *one with prefixed \*r- and another without it*. For example, [rd’] “to steal, thief”; rd’w “thieves, robbers” (EHD I, 437): [d’i] “to steal, theft” (EHD II, 895), rrm “to weep”: rm id. (EHD I, 424, 428).

### Comments I

As has already been mentioned, the grammatical function of /r-/ in Egyp. and CA is passive or reflexive (causative), and it is the same /r-/ I have already dealt with above in §§2.1.6.7, n. 7a, under *Comments* & 2.1.13.4, n. 5. This particular prefix, like any other affix, was orig. a separate word and had a definite meaning ‘*self*’. Although /r-/ had lost its status as a separate word and been reduced to a bound prefix in the course of millennia, yet it has never lost its meaning.

Besides “give”, Egyp. d’ also expresses “cause, set, place”. The following examples (quoted from EHD I, 436-437) proves that the meaning of /r-/ is orig. “self”, later came to function as ‘*passive affix*’.

- i) rd’ m s’ “to set oneself by the side of, i.e. *protect someone*”: m “by” and s’ “side or back”.
- ii) rd’ r ys-t “to seat oneself on a throne”: r “on”, ys-t “seat”.
- iii) rd’ r t’ “to set oneself on the ground, i.e. *establish oneself, arrive at a place, land*”: t’ “ground, earth”.
- iv) rd’ ḥr gs “to set oneself on one side”: ḥr “on”, gs “side”.
- v) rd’ s’ “to turn the side or the back”.

The signification assigned to /r-/ is self-evident in the first three examples, but it is not as such in the fourth sentence, since the aim of any bilingual dictionary is to translate the meaning of a source-language word or utterance into its nearest equivalent in the target language. In some cases this is done accurately, esp. *when single words are involved*; in some other cases it is not. Comparison of the sentence under study with d’ s’ “to give the back” (see §2.1.6.5, n. 4b above) reveals that the accurate meaning of rd’ s’ is “make oneself turn the back or the side”: see §2.15 below.

vi) The *comments* set forth above accounts only for one particular /r/, the one which has later come to be used as ‘*passive marker*’.

### Comments II

Words of *Tests VI* and *VII*, for example, compelled me to search for their ultimate origins. The findings indicate clearly that both *hāt* and arch. *hā’* express “to give” also “take” (LA r. 𐤇, i.e. *hā*), exactly like CIV ’a-’ṭā. This proves that /-t-/ is a grammatical infix and /-d-/ of *hadā* is variant.

**2.11.7** Phoen. nḥt “to descend” (PG, 123), Ug. nḥt “to go down, bring down” (UG, 531, 533), BHeb. nḥt “to go or come down, to descend”; *Piel*. "to press down", Syr. nḥt “to go down, descend”, BAram. nḥjat “to descend, come down”; Aph. "to bring down, lay

down” (OT, 666; Ryder, 1974: 104), OAram., OffAram., Palm., Nab. *nḥt* “to descend, to go (down)” (NWSI II, 726-727).

CA *nuḥāta-tu* [r, *nḥt*] = *ḥutātu* [r, *ḥt*] “bits and pieces that drop as one peels off a bark or bores a hole in the trunk of a tree”: *ḥatta* “to destroy, rub and peel”; *ta-ḥāta*, in *Hadith*, “to fall down, drop”, said of leaves; *ḥatatu* “a disease that make leaves fall”; CVII *’inḥatta* “to fall, drop (esp. hair)”. To LA [r, *ḥt*]: *ḥattu*, *’inḥitātu*, *taḥḥātu*, *taḥaṭḥutu* all signify “fall, drop (leaves)”.

1) Stem [*ḥat*] has already been seen in OAram., Phoen., BHeb. *šḥt*, etc. “to destroy” (§2.2.9 above), CA *saḥata* = *ḥtt* in meaning, i.e. “to eradicate, destroy” as in the Koran (20:61): (فيسحتكم بعداب); *ma-sḥatu*, said of money & property, “perishing” = *ḥatta*, said of money, property, “to perish” is from [*ḥt*], defined by Bin Faris (ML II, 28) as “falling down, as *leaves*, etc.” = *naḥītu* “wearing away”<sup>135</sup>.

**2.11.8** Akk. *napāšu* “to extend”, Mand. *npš* “to extend, augment, increase, be many” (MD, 304), CA *nafaša* “to spread out, scatter, swell out, bristle” < CA *fašā* “to spread out, break out”, BHeb. *pāšā(h)* “to spread”, Aram. *ps’* id. (OT, 872), OAram. *pšš* “to enlarge” (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 6), Egyp. *pšš* “to spread out”, Berb. *fsu* “étendre, disséminer”, To. *tē-fašt* “seed”, Cush.: Ag., Bil. *fad*, Qu. *foz* “semer” (VPHS, 168, n. 363).

1. Gesenius (OT, 872) notes that:

*«The primary idea (of Semitic \*pś-) is that of going apart and spreading out, a signification common to all verbs beginning with the syllables פ [ps], פ [pś], פ [pš], (פ, pt), and often expressed in Latin by the particle dis, di».*

In what follows, before giving my view on the syllables in question, we will discuss some examples he cites and the focus will be on the fact discovered in n. 2 below.

1a) BHeb. *pāša’* “to stride, go”; *peša’* “a stride, step”, BAram. *pəsa’* “to stride”. *«The primary idea (according to Gesenius ibid.) is that of throwing apart the legs».*

The CA cognate is *fašaya* “to spread out”; *fašyu* “widespread”; CV *tafaššaya*, said of any one, “to enter into (houses)” also strangely “to enter or go between a woman’s legs and have sexual intercourse with her”.

On the other hand, SL *fašah* “to stride”; *fašha-h* “a stride, a step”, perh. = BHeb. *psḥ* “limp, pass over” (Ryder, 1974: 132). In CA the same sort of meaning is expressed by *fašaḥa*, CII *faššaḥa* = *fašaḡa*, CII *faššaḡa* “to part the legs; to spread the legs” = SL

<sup>135</sup> *Is the common Semitic word \*taḥt- “under, down, below” from a stem \*ḥat or \*taḥ?* The word is seen in Phoen., Pun. *tḥt*, OAram., OffAram., Palm., Jar., Nab. *tḥt*, BHeb. *taḥat*, *taḥt(ay)*, Syr. *taḥōt*, CA *taḥta*, Ge. *taḥt*, Te. *tāḥat*, Tna. *taḥti*, Har. *taḥay*, etc. (NWSI II, 1209f; HED, 149).

Farāḥīdi (Al ‘Ayn III, 21) derives it from a biradical [*taḥ*] and considers its final /-t/ a suffix. Egyp *dḥ* “low; lowly”; *dḥ* “be low, abased” (EHD II, 885) seems to support Farāḥīdi’s view.

On the other hand, CA has [*ḥt*] in *ḥaṭṭa* “to bring down (s.t. from a high to low position), to set down, bring to a low position”; *munḥaṭṭu* “low”. It is unlikely that [*ḥt*] is from an original \**ḥaḍ*, which has survived only in *ḥaḍīḍu* “low, down, bottom”. It is more likely that final [-t] is a term for “earth”, while its first radical may be a prep. signifying “on”. For this prep., see §2.17.3, n. ii below.

faršah id., this is in turn = CA faršaḥ id. One may easily note that the quadrilaterals [fršh] and [fršḥ] have been created, like many others by dissimilation, whereby the first \*-š- of CA CII faššaḥa dissimilates to -r- (§2.17.80 below).

2) A view of far-reaching consequences on Hamito-Semitic root system is the following:

We have seen that CA faššaḥa > faršaḥa by dissimilation. *Can this same rule of dissimilation apply to CA CII faššaḥa? Suppose it does, the result would be farraḥa and never \*faršaḥa, since \*faršaḥa is impossible to pronounce and therefore does not exist in the language. If this supposition is correct, then people have derived CI faraḥa from CII farraḥa (i.e. faššaḥa) by back-formation.* It may be important to note here that throughout the history of the language the most widely used stems are CII, CIV and CVII, and that CIII, CVI, CVIII-CX do not exist. The central meaning of faraḥa is *to part, to open, to separate, etc. for the purpose of making a space between, bringing into view, etc.* see [nfḡ] in §2.11.28 below.

*A careful examination of all roots with medial liquid, most notably /-r-/ and /-l-/, reveals a simple fact that the status of the liquid as a root radical can rarely stand up to proof:* see §2.15.29 below for some illustrations.

2a) BHeb. pāšaḥ "to dispart the lips, to open wide (the lips)"; *Piel. id. of the feet*, in Syr. "to cleave" (OT, 872; Ryder, 1974: 115). OffAram. psg "to divide" (NWSI II, 922) may be cognate with this BHeb. trilateral or with CA [fšḡ] above. The CA cognate is certainly fašaḥu, said of the two horns, "wide apart from each other".

If one wants to express "legs are wide apart (e.g. as one does when urinating)", then the term to be used, as I expect, is fašaḥa. Again, as I expect, one can also use fašaḥa = SL faršah above, with infixed /-r-/.

3) Returning to [pšḡ], it can be divided into a proot [pa'] (see below) and a stem [šaḡ] "to part, to open" as in CA šaḡḡa, said of a tooth, "to break through", said of the day, "first appears, to peep", said of plants, "to sprout, shoot", said of anything "to split open, to split, to cut open, to crack, to scatter as a result of differences in opinion or feeling" also "to cut in two equal halves mirror of each other", hence 'each half' is šaḡḡu to the other, and in the course of time the word has developed into 'brother from the same father and mother'; šaḡḡa-tu fem. "sister"; šikḡu "slit, opening, split, rift; disunion, dissension", etc.

The root [šḡ], like [šḡ], denotes in CA "to split, cleave, break open" and it seems to be based on šaW-, which has given rise to a number of roots such as in [š'] expresses "to disperse, diffuse, spread, send out in all direction, radiate". The root [št], too, expresses in šattata "to disperse, scatter"; šattun, šatātu "scattered, dispersed"; šattā "different, miscellaneous, various". This same idea can also be expressed by [š'] as in CV ta-šā'ā "be scattered, dispersed"; muta-šā'in, said of anything, "different"; CV also expresses "be far (from one another or each other)", and -I think- this idea represents one of the deepest meanings of [ša']. The deep meaning in question is "extent, farness"<sup>136</sup>. For

<sup>136</sup> From the word ša'w "farness" above one may expect a derivative adj. \*šā'ī "far". This adj. is found, however, to belong to a trilateral [š'w/y] as in šā'ī, due to the interchange of /' / and /' /. The basic meaning of both [š'w/y] and [šw'] is "to scatter, spread, disperse". A third trilateral expressing the same sort of meaning is [š''] "to spread, scatter, disperse, etc.". In Sab. š'''

example, ša'w is semantically identical with šawtu "(a single) round, as in horserace, course of running", correctly defined by LA as "*running one time to a target*".

3) The trilateral [šwṭ] or [šwṭ] appears to be based on ša'w and its /-ṭ/ may be from the nominal suffix -t becoming /-ṭ-/ for phonotactic considerations in Semitic or more likely a proot for "earth". It is seen in BHeb. šwṭ "to run up and down, to go to and fro, hither and thither, in haste" also "to go over (the earth), travel" (OT, 1040)<sup>137</sup> = CA "to go on a long journey, to run", JAram. šwṭ "to roam, to rove about" (NWSI II, 1116), Egyp. swtwt (~ reduplicated swtswt) "to journey, to travel, to walk about a place"; swtwt "a journey" (EG, 589; EHD II, 653).

In going back to our main topic, I believe that \*p-, i.e. [pa'] above expresses "to split, be apart; apart". We have already dealt with this proot, as well as with [ba'], in §§2.8.17 & 3.8.18 above.

**2.11.9** CA nadafa "to hasten", Sab. ndf "to rush" also "light cavalry" (SD, 91), BHeb. ndp "to drive away, scatter, put to flight", Eth. ndf "to strike, push" (OT, 652) < CA daffa "to run, walk"; dāfa-tu fem. "a group of people walking together" also "army moving forward", Cush.: Ga. dafa "to hasten"; dafa adj. "prompt, quick, swift"; dafi "haste".

For derivatives of [dap] with [h-] and [š], see §2.4.14 above, and for the signification of Eth. ndf, see §2.11.32 below. The Egyp. cognate is dfn "to hasten" (EHD II, 877), where /n/ is a suffix.

**2.11.10** BHeb. nādaḥ "to thrust, thrust out, cast down, impel", NHeb. "to scatter" (OT, 651, Ryder, 1974: 113), CA CV ta-naddaḥa "be driven away and spread" (said of small cattle): PHS stem \*daḥ-. It is quite evident that the trilateral is formed from CVII of [r. dḥ], which signifies "to enlarge, stretch" also "to thrust, push" as in CA dḥḥ, dḥy id., dḥm, dḥb, dḥr "to push away, drive away", etc., BHeb. dḥh [dḥy] "to push, thrust, knock down", dḥḥ "to thrust", dḥp "to thrust, impel", dḥḵ "to thrust, push, press down" (OT, 220) = CA dḥḵ to repulse, drive away", etc.

**2.11.11** CA našara "to saw"; minšāru inst. "a saw", BHeb. nśr, obsol, BAram. nsr "to saw", Syr., Mand. nsr "to saw" < CA šarra [r. šr] "to saw" and with prefixed caus. ' -

---

expresses "to grow, flourish (crops)" (SD, 137) = CA CIV 'aša''a.

An unexpected traditional derivative of this root is CVIII 'išta'ā "to listen". This meaning is commonly expressed by 'istama'a, CVIII of sami'a "to hear", from PSem. [šm'] id. Other unexpected derivatives are šā'a-nī (-nī = me) "pleased or delighted (me)" also "make (me) sad" (= šwḵ: see §2.7.34 above), which could be from an etymologically different root (LA). Similarly, šai'ā-n, used only as an adj., "farsighted" = Akk. ša'u "to look at, loo", ESA s²'w "to look after", etc.

The word šā'ā "corruption" is from θa'ā, while ša'w "courage and fortitude" from sa'w. The same proot is also discussed in §2.17.60 below, under *Comments*.

<sup>137</sup> BHeb. šwṭ "to whip, to lash" seems to be from a different root: cf. CA sāṭa id.; sawtu "a whip" = BHeb. šōṭ id. = Eth. swṭ id., Egyp. š'ṭ id. (EHD II, 729).

becoming a part of the root: 'ašara [r. 'šr] "to saw", hence mi'šāru = minšāru above = "saw" (LA; ŞHH II, 579), with prefixed w- becoming a part of the root: wašara [r. wšr] "to saw", Meh. wušor, Jib 'šr id., Eth. wšr id., BHeb. šūr "to saw"; ma-šōr "saw" (OT, 699, 1007, MD. 302-303), Chad.: Housa sārā "cut (trees)", Gisiga šar, Mofu šar "adze, shave", Cush.: Som. sar "cut" (HSED, 542), etc. The root is also found in Egyp. sw, ws "to saw" (EHD I, 181, II, 648).

**2.11.12** OAkk. nasāhu "to tear out" (Gelb, 1961: 180) also "uproot, remove" (AG, 91), Assy. nasāhu "to tear out or away, remove", BHeb. nāsaḥ "to uproot; remove" (King, 1898: 369), OAram. nsḥ "to tear out" (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 5) = CA nasaḥa Koranic (2: 106) "to abolish, do away with; remove": PHS stem [saḥ] in Assy. usaḥhi "to destroy, blot out, overthrow" (King, op.cit.: 372), CA saḥḥa "to dig", Egyp. sh "to strike, break, beat" (EHD II, 685, 614.):

**2.11.13** Akk. nabālu "to demolish", Assy. nabālu "to destroy, to steal" (King, 1898: 366), BHeb. nabal "to wither": PHS stem [bal] as in Assy. balū "to go to ruin"; uballi "to destroy" (King, 1898: 338), Ug., Aram. bly "be worn out" (DRS II, 66), CA CVIII 'ibtalā "be afflicted"; balā'u "tribulation, affliction". The root is also seen in §2.3.22 above.

**2.11.14** Akk. naṭalu "to see" (Rabin, 1975: 89), Assy. naṭālu "to look, gaze, look up, glance" (King, 1898: 368), BHeb., BAram. nṭl "to lift up" also "burden" (OT, 668), OffAram., Hatra. nṭl "to lift" (NWSI, II, 728): PHS stem [ṭal]: CA ṭalla "to look down from above, to look over or at from a higher place, to rise above so as to afford a view over, overlook". LA [r. ṭll] states that: «'iṭlālu = overlook: looking over or at a thing from a higher place...ṭaṭāla-t (-t = she) 'raised or lifted herself up to overlook'».

a) For the notion of "burden" as expressed by BHeb.-Aram words above, CA ṭulāṭila-tu "calamity" also "diachronic illness". This meaning is implied in Lam 3, 28, נָטַל כִּי עָלַי לְפָנֶיךָ יְיָ for God hath laid upon him, sc. calamity (OT, 668).

**2.11.15** OAkk. n'š "to live" (Gelb 1961: 179), Assy. nēšu "to live", Egyp. 'nḥ "to live", CA na'aša "to enliven, reanimate, revive" (Albright, JAOS, 47, p. 208, n. 10). All are definitely from the root in CA 'āša "to live", Tham. 'yys CII "faire vivre" (Branden, 1950: 516) = CA CII 'yyš in 'aiyaša id, Sab. 'št [r. 'yš] "peaceful life" (SD, 24) = CA 'īša-tu fem. "life". LA reports that OYem. 'yš expresses "food" = CA 'ayšu "food and drink as necessary elements for life".

1) Before attempting to determine the ultimate origin of [n'š] and ['yš], it is important to note that CA na'aša above has a variant na'aša as in the PIP of Nabiyah:

«wa mā zāla ḥusnāya ta'tīhim wa tan'ašuhum...» (DN, p. 44, L. 4).

However, LA (r. n'š), following Ibin Sidihi, considers na'aša as variant of na'aša.

2) I have few words to say about the interchange of radicals in general and of /' / and /ʾ / in particular, esp. in languages like CA and Egyp. I have thus far given so many examples illustrating interchanges of consonants on many occasions, and I will continue doing so as long as the discussion seems to demand, though without delving into the

underlying structure. For the time being, it is necessary to recognize ‘two types of interchange’:

2a) A surface interchange as in CA  $\theta a^{\prime} - \sim sa^{\prime} - \sim ta^{\prime}$  - “flow”.

2b) A deep interchange, whereby two radicals are found in the deepest structure of a primitive compound word like, for example, [ $\text{'āš}$ ] from  $*a(\text{'})\text{'ay-š-}$ . One dialect keeps / $\text{'}$ / and another keeps / $\text{'}$ / (see §2.14, n. 4 below). This cannot be called ‘interchange’, and a new term should be coined to stand for it. A similar example is CA  $\text{'iddu}$  “copious water” in §2.11.4, n b above.

**2.11.16** CA  $nazaḥa$  “to migrate from home, move away” = BHeb.  $nāsaḥ$  “to pluck out, tear away, i.e. *a person from his dwelling* (Ps. 52, 7), *from his country*, i.e. *drive into exile* (Prov. 2, 22), BAram.  $nəsaḥ$  “be plucked out” (OT, 676), OffAram.  $nsḥ$  “to tear out, pluck out, remove” (NWSI II, 734): <  $*za-ḥ-$  as in CA  $zaḥḥa$ ,  $zaḥzaḥa$ , with reduplication, “to move or remove s.t. from its place” (ŠHH I, 371; LA). SL  $ziḥ-t$  “I move (from place)”, but  $nazaḥ-t li$ . “I make myself move or go away from one place to another”. See my *comments* on this root and its kindreds in §2.11.17 below.

**2.11.17** Phoen.  $nz^{\prime}$  “take away, remove” (Bustani, 1985: 89), CA  $naza^{\prime}a$  “to uproot, pull up, pluck out, to take away”, BHeb.  $ns^{\prime}$  “to break up”, Sab.  $nz^{\prime}$  “to withdraw allegiance” (SD, 101). The BHeb. root also means “to bend a bow” (= CA  $nazi^{\prime}a$  id.); “to remove” (= CA  $nazi^{\prime}a$ , CVIII  $\text{'intaza^{\prime}a}$  id.); “to journey, migrate” (= CA  $naza^{\prime}a$  “be homesick, to yearn for one’s country”;  $nāzi^{\prime}u$  “foreigner”)<sup>138</sup>, etc. (cf. OT, 677). Sab. root  $nz^{\prime}$  also means “to come to grip with enemy” (= CA CIII  $nāza^{\prime}a$ , CVI  $tanāza^{\prime}a$  “dispute with, contest”): PHS stem [ $za^{\prime}$ ] as in CA  $za^{\prime}za^{\prime}a$  “to shake something in order to uproot, to pull out or remove it”.

### Comments

It appears that  $*z^{\prime}$ - and  $*zḥ-$  are variants of the same proot and, to my understanding, the proot is  $*zW-$  as SL  $\text{'azai-t}$  “I move along (usu. to make space for somebody)” also “I remove”; imper.  $\text{'ez!}$  The same proot is seen with l-ext. as in CA  $zāla$  “to depart from one’s place, move away from a position or place”. Thu Rummah says:

«...’iḏā mā ra’atnā  $zīla$   $\text{'anhā}$   $zawāluḥā$ ».

CIV  $\text{'azāla}$  “to remove s.t. from a position or place, to eliminate s.t. from a place, make disappear” as in the PIP of Labid:

«wa  $naḥnu$   $\text{'azal-nā}$   $\text{Ṭaiyi^{\prime}an}$   $\text{'an bilādina...}$ » (DL, p. 198, L. 1).

CIV above is semantically almost identical with CIV  $\text{'azāḥa}$ . The only difference in meaning is that the former expresses *elimination or removal from a place and is usu. accompanied by disappearance of the thing in question*; the latter just denotes the removal from a place.

OffAram.  $zwl$  “to remove, transfer”, EHeb.  $zwlh$  “removal” (NWSI I, 307), SA: Meh.  $hezwīl$ , Hars.  $azwīl$  “partir dans l’après-midi”, Meh., Hars.  $zewōl$  “début de l’après-midi” (cf. CA ( $\text{'az}$ )  $zawāl$  “(the) sun set, evening”), Meh.  $azwīl$ , Jib.  $ezbel$  “ennuyer,

<sup>138</sup> This special meaning of [ $nz^{\prime}$ ] belongs to an etymologically different trilateral.

importuner” (= CA ’az-zawāl ~ ’az-zawāl id.), etc. see §2.3.40 above.

To the proot under discussion also belong with suffixed /-ḥ/: CA zāḥja “to depart, go away, move”; CIV ’a-zāḥja (mentioned above) “to remove, pluck out, displace”, BHeb. zāḥja(h) “be moved, shoved, displaced” (OT, 276), Mand. zuh, zha “to move, shake, stir, agitate” (MD, 164), and with suffixed -’: BHeb. zū’a “to shake, agitate, move oneself” (OT, 275), BAram. zw’ “to tremble” (Rosenthal, 1963: 83), CA zā’a “to press s.t. or s.o. to move forward or run, to agitate and move”, Targ., Syr. zā’ “to move, to stir, be startled, to tremble”, Ge. zo’a “to tremble, to agitate” (DRS VIII, 707), etc. With prefixed w-: SA: Jib. zaḥé, ezḥé “écarter, bousculer” (DRS VI, 516). One should, however, pay attention to a fact that an earlier \*ḏ- may lie beneath \*z- not only in the trilaterals cited above, but in so many others.

**2.11.18** CA nahaza, Syr. nhz “to arouse commotion, excite”, Man. nhz “to move noisily, cause disturbance, shake about” (MD, 291): [haz] > CA hazza “to shake, agitate, stir, move, rock”, SA: Meh. hāz, Jib. hezz “to shake”, Eth.: Te. hazāz belā “to budge”, etc. (DRS V, 394).

**2.11.19** BHeb. nā’ar “to shake”; *Piel.* “to shake out” (OT, 679), CA na’ara, said of people, “to get together and rouse, agitate”. It also denotes, according to A’šma’i, “to rise” (LA). All are from PHS stem \*’ar- as in CA ’ar’ara “to move and shake”, etc. see §§2.8.4-5 above.

**2.11.20** BHeb. nezem “a nose-ring”, CA naḏama “to perforate, to string pearls”; naḏmu “a string of pearls”; naḏdama “to systematize”; niḏāmu “system”: PHS stem \*ḏam- as in BAram. zmm “to muzzle”, Eth. zmm “a ring in the nose of animals to be tamed” (OT, 661), CA zimāmu (< \*ḏimāmu) “a string or thread in the nose of an animal; rein”.

**2.11.21** OAram. n’b “to long for, covet” (NWSI II, 710f) = OAram. htn-’bw “be envious” (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 1) = BHeb. tā’ab = CA ’abba, see §2.7.21 above.

**2.11.22** Ug. npl “to fall” (UG, 532), OAram. npl “to fall” (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 5), Phoen. npl (PG, 125), OffAram., Palm., Nab. npl id. (NWSI, II, 741), BHeb. nāpal, BAram., Syr. npl “to fall” (OT, 681), Akk. napālu, CA, Sab. npl “to fall”: PHS stem \*pal- as in CA CVII ’in-falla (of falla) “to fall apart” also “be scattered and defeated in a battle” = Sab. nfl “to fall in a battle” also “spoils, booty” (SD, 92) = CA nafalu “spoils, booty” also, according to Abu Ali Ḳali (Amāli II, p. 194), “defeated people”, Chad.: Sura fāl “to fall”, Chip pal, Dera yupele id. (HSED, n. 1936). The stem is also seen in §§2.2.21 and 2.3.11 above.

a) One may note that CA n-, forming CVII stems, has become part of the root only in some of its occurrences, but part of the root in other Semitic languages. A rare form found in BHeb. is Pil. נפלל niplal, with two l’s, “to fall” (OT, 683). It seems to me that the BHeb. /-l/ is repeated to intensify the meaning, and this is also found in CA and Egyp. as in Egyp. špss “be rich, enrich” (šps “noble”), spdd “to supply” (spd “ready”): cf. EG, §274.

b) To the stem \*pal- “to fall” belongs Phoen. mplh “ruins”, orig. “place (= m- “place”) of falling things”. For the semantic relationship between “fall” and “ruins”: Akk.-Assyr.: maḳātu “to fall” > maḳittu “ruins”, from. \*ḳṭ- > mḳṭ- respectively (see §2.22.17): PHS stem \*fal- as in Chad.: Sura pal, Chip pal, Dera yupele id. (HSED, n. 1936).

c) BHeb. nepel, BAram. nēpal “an abortion, which falls from the womb”, Talm. npl “premature birth” (OT, 682, 683): CA npl “nepew” (see §2.3.11 above).

**2.11.23** Akk. nahēru “nostril”, BHeb. nēḫiraim id.; naḫar “a snoring”, Syr. nḫr “to snore, snort”, Eth. nḫr “to snore” (Rabin, 1975: 91, n. 62; OT, 665), Phoen. nḫr “snort” (PG, 123), CA nahara “to snort, breathe hard through the nose”; minhāru “nose”; nuḫra-tu “nostril”, JAram. nwḫr “nostril” (NWSI II, 722), Soq. naḫrir “nose”, Meh. nahrir id.: PHS stem \*har- as in CA ḥarra “to snore”.

From this proot some other trilaterals have developed: cf. CA šahara “to snuffle”, from { \*š (?) + hr } and [mhr] in ’imtahara, CVIII, “to breathe through the nose”, from /\*m + hr/, the \*m is originally inst.: \*miḫāru = minhāru = “nose”.

Here belong Chad.: Housa min-šāri “to snore”, Warji šər-mə, Diri šərma, Ngizim žankor id., Cagu ngwar, Mburku ngur-, Kariya ngər id., Mobu angore, Ngamo oṅgore id., (HSED, n. 534, 1901).

**2.11.24** BHeb. nṣḥ “be clear, pure, faithful, true”, CA, Eth. nṣḥ id. (OT, 688), BAram. nṣḥ “to distinguish”, TAram. nṣḥ “be illustrious, to shine” (Ryder, 1974: 137), Ge., Tna. nəṣuḥ “white”, etc. (HED, 117): PHS stem ṣaḥ- “be correct, sound, true” as in CA ṣaḥḥa “be correct, sound, true”; ṣaḥḥu “correct”; ṣaḥḥu “true, whole, perfect, correct, genuine”, Sab. ṣḥ(h) “sound, intact” (SD, 142), see §2.11.37 below.

**2.11.25** Assy. nahalu “to bore a hole” (Hurwitz, 1913:102), in Akk. nahalu “to sift, winnow”, Aram. neḫal id.; maḥḥultā “sieve”, CA nahhala “to sift”, i.e. *make fine particles fall through the holes of the sieve and coarse particle remain in the sieve*; munḥalu “sieve”, SL minhul id.: Phoen., BHeb. ḥll “to pierce”, etc. the same biliteral is also seen with prefixed caus. š-, see §2.2.56.2 above.

**2.11.26** Assy. nakāmu “to heap up” (King, 1898: 368) = CA kāma id.; kauma-tu “a heap”, Tham. km “high, lofty” (Branden, 1950: 514), kīmā “a heap, cluster, esp. of stars” (OT, 464). The same biliteral is also seen with prefixed r-, see §2.15.11 below.

**2.11.27** BAram ntr “to shake off” (Rosenthal, 1963: 90), BHeb. nātar “to tremble”; *Piel*. “to spring up and down, leap, move by leaps”, Syr. ntr “to fall, as *leaves, fruit*”, etc. (OT, 706), CA natara “to pull, draw, to shake”: PHS stem \*tar- “to tremble, shake (off)” as in Assy. tarāru “to tremble, shake” (King, 1898: 399), CA tarra “to move” as in *Hadith*: «tartirūhu wa mazmizūhu» also “to fall, to leap, as *stones of fruits*” (ṢḤḤ II, 600-601; LA); tartara id.

**2.11.28** CA nafaḡa “make an animal (e.g. rabbit) jump out of its hiding place (and, of



course, ‘come into view’), to extract” also “to enlarge and rise”; CVIII ‘intaḥaḡa, said of flanks, lit. “to come out and rise, come into view” = CVII ‘inbaḡḡa [bg]; CX ‘istanḥaḡa “make come out and become visible” (LA). It is possible that BAram. nbḡ “to sprout”, Aram., Mand. nbḡ “to rise, spring up, sprout” are from a variant triliteral (OT, 680; MD, 287): CA nabaḡa, said of partridge, “to come out from its hiding place” (Al ‘Ayn VI, 152), CII ‘inbaḡḡa above.

The basic meaning of [nfḡ], according to Farāhīdī (Al ‘Ayn VI) and hence to all other old Arab scholars, is “to rise (i.e. *come into view*), come out”. The n- in both [npg] and [nbg] is reflex.-caus.: CA faḡwa-tu [fḡw/y] ~ furḡa-tu [frḡ] (with infixed /-r-/) “large space between two things” ~ faḡḡu [fḡ] “large road between two mountains”, according to Ibin Shamil, but according to Abu Haitham, “any path which is far is called *faḡḡu*” (LA); faḡā “to open”<sup>139</sup>; CVII ‘infaḡā, said of people, = CVII ‘infaraḡū + ‘inkaṣafū “be at a distance from s.o. and open to view”; faḡā = faḡaḡu “the two legs or feet are far from each other, lameness”<sup>140</sup>; faḡḡā ~ faḡā “to widen the space between the legs” (= farraḡa); faḡ- [fḡw/y] also expresses “swollen foot”, said of a she camel, “having big-bellied”<sup>141</sup> = faḡi’ā, said of a she camel, “have big-bellied”; faḡa’a ~ faḡaw ~ faḡḡa, said of a bow, “raise or lift up its string away from the middle”; faggāḡu = naffāḡu “to boast, brag”.

Egypt. pg’ “to open, spread out, open the arms and legs”; pg, pg’ “passage, defile, valley, ravine” (EHD I, 252), Cush.: Ga. fago “far”, Som. fog id. (Zaborski, 1975: 323). In OYem. ‘ifḡḡ “deep valley”, but CA ‘ifḡḡu signifies “large valley” (LA), Sab. fg “path” (SD, 43).

As one “comes into view, becomes visible, comes out”, he is in a position to “meet, encounter, make contact with, come upon” as expressed by Semitic [pḡ’]: Phoen., Pun., OffAram., JAram., Mand., Syr., EHebr. pg’ id. (NWSI II, 900; MD, 366), CA fḡ’ id., and to “come upon suddenly” as expressed by CA fḡ’ id.

**2.11.29** Ug. npḡ “to go out” (UG, 533), OAram. npḡ “to go out, take out, bring out” (Rosenthal, AG, 12), OffAram., Hatra., Palm., Nab., JAram. npḡ, “to leave, go forth” (NWSI II, 741f), Mand., Syr. npḡ, Eth. nfḡ “to go out, come out, leave”; Mand. napaḡa “departing soul”, often used in rituals (MD, 304, 284), BAram. npḡ “to go out, go forth”; nipḡā “expenses” (OT, 684), CA CII naffaḡa “to go out, emerge, come out”, usu. animals from their underground hiding-places, hence nafaḡu = “subway, tunnel” as in the Koran: (نفقا في الأرض أو سلما في السماء), (you can seek) *a tunnel or an opening* (to go down) *into the earth or a ladder* (to ascend up) *the heaven* (6: 35); nafaḡa “to die (small

<sup>139</sup> Comp. ‘aḡāfa “to close, shut”, by shifting the order of radicals and prefixing, BHeb. gwp *Hiph.* “to shut, e.g. a door” (OT, 185).

<sup>140</sup> It is described as “*worse than faḡḡu*”, another term for ‘lameness’. On the other hand, Mand. pargalta “lameness” (MD, 361) = CA falaḡu “paralysis”.

<sup>141</sup> SL faḡḡ, said of fruit, “unripe” = CA fiḡḡu id., BHeb. pag id. (OT, 833), said of a young girl’s breast, “(begin to) expand + rise”. This meaning is expressed in CA by [nfḡ] as nafaḡa, said of a woman’s breast as subj., lit. “cause the shirt to rise”, seems to be from CVII \*’infaḡḡa of [fḡ].

and large cattle), prob. originally applies only to “cow” (see below), but later, its range of application is widened in scope (the deep meaning is “go out, depart”); CVII ’anfaḵa “to spend (money), make an article sell well”, with an underlying meaning “go out” as in the Koran: (إذا لمستم خشية الإنفاق), *then you will certainly withhold them for fear of spending* (17:100); nafaḵa-tu “expenses, expenditure” = BAram. nipḵā above and OffAram., Palm., Nab. npḵh “expenditure, costs” (NWSI II, 743-744).

1) In what follows I will attempt to determine the meanings of the elements forming the compound /n p ḵ/ and to connect some other Semitic trilaterals with the newly discovered compound. The discussion will be complex and wide in scope, and there will be considerable ramifications, which will ultimately light upon the ultimate origins of hundreds of Semitic trilaterals. It may be well to begin our study by taking a look at what the old Arab scholars had to say about the trilateral in question.

1a) Bin Faris (ML V, 454-456) considers the trilateral as expressing two different lexical meanings: (a) ‘*perish*’ and (b) ‘*hide, conceal*’, and he derives “go out, emerge” from the 2<sup>nd</sup> notion. SL (and in all other dialects) nb’ (i.e. *nabaḵ*), and not nafa’ (i.e. nḵ), expresses “(make oneself/itself) emerge or come out”, usu. *from a hidden place or from an unseen place*, while [nf] expresses all other remaining meanings expressed by that of CA above. It is quite clear to me that n- is a prefix, and that the proot is [ba’, i.e. baḵ] as in the proverb «ba’ (= CII make go/come out) l-baḥṣā (= stone, pebble)», is said *when one discloses s.t. he hides as if the thing is like a small stone inside his mouth*: CA baḵḵa “to come out, emerge” (LA; MA, 45), faḵḵa, too, expresses a similar meaning “to open, be separated; in the sense *making an opening through*”. We may also add CA faḡḡa, faḡā. It is important to note that [npḡ] expresses a meaning similar to that of [npḵ] (see §2.11.28 above).

1b) A related trilateral is seen in BHeb. pwḵ “to go out” also “let succeed, bring out fully, further, supply, give out, cause someone to give, i.e. *to get, obtain from any one*” (OT, 839), Ug. pwḵ “to acquire” (UG, 530), Phoen. p-ḵ “to come upon, find”, Bab. puḵḵu (PG, 136).

1c) BHeb., Phoen. etc. pwḵ above are to be connected with CA [wḵ] as in ta-waffaḵa “to prosper, succeed” (= BHeb. “let succeed, get, obtain” & Ug. “acquire”, etc. above); wafaḵa “to meet, come upon, find” (= Phoen. pwḵ above, also Phoen. pḵ-t perh. “profit”: cf. NWSI II, 933, etc.); CVIII ’ittafaḵa (\*’iwtafaḵa) “to happen; chance” also “to agree with”; CII waffaḵa “to fit, make suitable, make prosper”; mu-wāfiḵu “suitable, convenient, fit, compatible”, etc. = Min. wḵ “be equivalent”, Jib. efeḵ “be suitable” (= CA mu-wāfiḵu id.), Meh. wafūḵ “to go through, cross”, etc. DRS VII, 588.

It is most important to note that some of the meanings expressed by [pwḵ] and [wpḵ] are denoted by proot \*[pW-] even such notions as “suitable, convenient” as in CA mū-fī “sufficient for, suitable for, etc.”: ya-fī (bi ’al yaraḍi) “be convenient, suitable, adequate, sufficient”.

2) On the other hand, CA [nḵ] “to emerge, die” and [wḵ] above are closely connected with CA [fwḵ], the apparent cognate of BHeb. pwḵ, etc. above. CA fāḵa, CIV ’afaḵa “to wake up” also “to excel”; fā’iḵu “excellent, magnificent, outstanding” = ’afiḵu “magnificent, wonderful; generous, well-bred” = Phoen. pḵh perh. “magnificence, greatness”: cf. NWSI II, 933); fauḵ “death”; fauḵu “above, up, over, on”. The following

facts should be noted:

3) CA *fauḵu* “death” originally meant, according to Abu Amr (LA, r. *fwḵ*), “*first path*” and the Arabs say in supplication: «*raġi’a ’ilā fūḵihi*» “He returned to his first path”, i.e. *He died*. Accordingly, the word has originally nothing to do with “death”. It should be born in mind that stating Abu Amr’s view- or anybody’s view- should never give the impression that I accept it or it is correct. We will evaluate his view below in (6) below, and determine the ultimate origin of the trilateral in (6a) below.

4) According to LA, the deep meaning of CA *’afāḵa* is not “wake up”, but rather “*to go back in order to accomplish what one was doing before sleeping*”, hence, the signification “wake up from sleep” has little to do with its deep meaning. The deep meaning is, according to LA, “*time intervening (or elapsed) between doing something- then, stop for one reason or another (e.g. go to bed, get drunk or lose consciousness) and afterward- going back to continue doing it*” (so, ‘*sleep*’ = ‘*time elapsed between two activities*’). Hence, *’afāḵa*, said of a she-camel, “to milk it and then wait for some time and go back to milk it again”; *fuwāḵu* “time intervening between such two *\*milkings*”; *fīḵa-tu* [roots *fwḵ* & *fyḵ*] is a term for “cow-milk collected from such two *\*milkings*” as in the PIP of A’sha:

«ḥattā ’iḏā *fīḵatun* fī ḍar’ihā ’iġtama’at

ġā’at liturḍi’a *ṣīḵḵ* (’a)n nafsi law raḍa’ā» (DA, p. 122, L. 9);

ta-fauwaḵa “to give a drink (of this kind of milk); to drink (that milk), to drink”. It is *indeed surprising* to find Ug. *pwḵ* expressing “to drink” (UG, 532). The only other meaning expressed by [*fyḵ*] is “to die” = *fwḵ* “death” above.

5) CA [*fwḵ*] is semantically and etymologically related to, at least, two trilaterals [*fḵ*] and [*ftḵ*] (see §2.8.18 above), and the concept “(between) two things” as expressed by such trilaterals makes us understand and appreciate the clear cut distinction of meaning made by old Arab scholars between *nafaḵu* (above) and *sarbu*, both mean “subway, tunnel”. Tha’ālibi state: «(The term) *nafaḵu* can be used only if there is an exit or way out. Otherwise, *sarbu* is used» (FL, 3: 2, p. 35). Thus *nafaḵu* has both, an entrance and an exist, i.e. *two openings*, whereas *sarbu* has only an entrance, i.e. *one opening*. Farāhīdi (Al ’ayn V, 177), states that «*nafaḵu* is an underground tunnel (*sarbu*) leading to another place». Similarly, Jawhari (ṢḤḤ IV, 1560) and Bin Faris (ML V, 455), etc. define *nafaḵu* as «An underground tunnel (or *sarbu*) having a way out», i.e. *with two openings*. Both terms occur in the Koran: *nafaḵu* (6: 35) and *sarbu* (18: 61). Let us discuss the implications of this difference in meaning.

5a) The difference in meaning between CA *nafaḵu* and *sarbu* above is faithfully reflected in their derived verbs: *naffaḵa* denotes “to go out or come out from an underlying place, house, shelter, etc.”, *because of the presence of a way out or exit in its underlying semantic content* = JAram., Nab. m-npḵw “exit” (NWSI II, 662), whereas *sarraba* denotes “to go into an underlying place”, because there is no way out in its underlying semantic content. Hence, Semitic *\*npḵ* “go out, come out, emerge, etc.” above.

5b) The word *nafaḵa* comprises two parts *\*n-* and *\*faḵ-* from [*fwḵ*]. The trilateral [*fwḵ*] is a compound of *\*fw-* “interval between two things, space between” as in CA *fautu* “space between, interstice; to have an interval between two things”; BHeb. *fwṭ* “an

interstice, space between” (OT, 874), Akk. apt- “ouverture, fenêtre” (DRS I, 30), Mand. puta “opening, aperture” (MD, 369), Cush.: Som. futo “anus, vulva”, Oromo futee “anus”, Chad. Jegu. paate “vulva”, Angas fut “hole”, etc. (Müller, 1975: 64-65, n. 12; HSED, n. 836). SL fāt (by Imālah fīt) r. [fwt] expresses “to go into or enter into an opening (the opening here may be a door, window, etc.); CII caus. “make enter into”<sup>142</sup>.

5c) CA nafaḳa “to die (cattle)” may be a compound of prefixed \*n- “not” plus \*fwḳ “wake up” above, and the original meaning is “not wake up”, i.e. “die” (a phrase one may use to avoid using the term *māta* ‘die’). One strong objection to this analysis is based on the fact that [fwḳ & fyḳ] also express “to die” as in *fāḳa* “to die”, lit. “give one’s soul over to death, make one’s soul go out”, hence *fuwāḳu* “the last struggle that precedes death or before giving up one’s last breath” (lit. *making one’s last breath go out*, i.e., to my understanding, “go in upward direction”). In accordance with this fact \*n- seems to be reflexive. Apparently, there is a Semitic root \*pW- signifying “to die” as in CA ta-wa-ffā “to die”; wa-fā-tu, fem., “death” (see §2.20.5, n. 2-4 below), also [fwt] in fautu “sudden death”, [fyḏ] in faidu “death, funeral” ~ [fyḏ] in fāḏa “to die”. It should be noted that fāḏa ~ fāda are, according to Farrā’, dialectal variants. The former is common in the old dialects of Hiḡāz and Ṭay’, and the latter in Ḳudā’ah, Tamīm and Qais (LA, r. fyḏ, also see ŞHH III, 1099). We may add another common pre-Islamic verb fāda “to die” as in the PIP of Labid:

«ra’ā harazāti (’a)l mulki ’iṣrīna ḡiḡḡatan

wa ’iṣrīna ḡattā fāda wa (’a)ṣ ṣaibu ṣāmilu» (DL, p. 136, L. 9).

Phoen. pwd (~ pyd) “to suffer, come to grief” (NWSI II, 902).

### Concluding Remarks

6) Abu Amr’s view on /fūḳi-hi/ in (3) above as denoting “his (= -hi) first path” > ‘he died’ above is simply wrong. The word fūḳ- is a variant of *fauḳ* “above” and used here as *metaph.* for “sky, heaven”, thus «*raḡi’a ’ilā fūḳihi*» above = “returned to his paradise/heaven”, i.e. *he died*. One can also say: «*raḡi’a ’ilā ’alyā’ihi*» = returned to his paradise/heaven”, i.e. *he died*, from ‘alā “on, above” also “be high, be above” (cf. Phoen. ’l “on, over”, CA, OAram., BHeb. ’l, etc. gen. Sem. id.), hence ‘alyā’u *metaph.* “sky”. Thus the word fūḳ- has definitely nothing to do with “death” or with “path”, it simply means “above” > *metaph.* “heaven, sky”, and consists of \*fw- “going upward” above and \*-ḳ- (perh. “one’s home in heaven”: see (7) below, or, more likely, “one’s soul, figure”).

Abu Amr’s view is not, however, entirely wrong; it is *half-wrong*. The word may denote ‘first’, but never “first path”. The notion ‘first’, which seems to be from “beginning, start”, is one of the essential components of the underlying semantic structure of \*fw-. Why did Abu Amr attach to [fwḳ] the signification of “first” is indeed a matter to be wondered at, esp. because the triliteral does not overtly express ‘first’ by any of its derivatives at all. This is undoubtedly based on his intuitive knowledge of the language. For \*fw- “first”, see below.

<sup>142</sup> The proot [pau] may be related to \*pw- “mouth” as in Akk., CA pū, etc. gen. Semitic id.: CA pūhu “mouth”; fūha-tu, fem., “opening, orifice, aperture”. For this particular \*-t of [pwt], see §2.9 above.

6a) As for CA *fautu* “sudden death”, it is derived from *fāta* “go away, be over, be before in time” as Tham. *ft* “passer” (Branden, 1950: 517) = Egyp. *p’-t* “remote ages” below, Chad.: Angas *pūt*, Housa *pita*, Sura *pūt*, Bolewa *pete*, Musgu *put* “go out”, Tangale *pod*, Bele *feti id.*, Cush.: Xamta *fit-*, Aungi *fat-* “go away”, Iraqw *fiit* “drive, run after” (HSED, n. 783; Müller, 1975: 69, n. 72), Xamir *fi* “go out”.

Another basic meaning of [fwt] in SL and also in CA is “past, afore” as in l-layli l fēyti < CA ’al layla-tu ’al fā’ita-tu “yesterday” (lit. the night the past, i.e. *the past night*). The perfect and imperfect of this verb are as follows:

Perf.: CA *fāta* ’al waḡtu “the time passed or was over”;

Imperf. CA (neg.) *lam yafut* lit. “it (is) not over, it is still” (time), etc. see 6c below.

6b) CA *fāḡa*, CIV ’afāḡa as defined by LA in (4) above, it is a compound of \*f- “coming back or returning to a previous state” (§§2.7.12, 2.17.13, 2.17.14 below) plus a proot \*-ḡ- (meaning ?).

6c) Returning to CA *fāta*, we find that its signification “pass away (in the context of time), be over, be late, go beyond” is confined only to the perfect. In the imperfect, however, *yafūtu* (usu. preceded by the negative *lam* as shown above) “it is over (in the context of time)”. In the future the concept of time is also central, as in *sayafūtuni* (’a)r *rakbu* or (’a)l *ḡiṡāru* “the caravan will leave me”. The deep & surface meaning of ‘will leave me’, however, is ‘will be before me in time’. The only explanation of this phenomenon is that the word is a compound of \*p- and \*(’)t- “time”. The first element signifies “past, afore”, perh. = Egyp. *p’-t* “remote ages” (EHD, 230).

7) HS [npḡ] *go out, emerge, etc.* above consists of at least three morphemes: a reflexive \*n-, a proot \*fau (or \*faw-) “to rise, emerge, move in upward direction”, hence come into view”, etc. and \*-ḡ-. In combining these three words together, we get a sentence expressing a concrete meaning “make oneself + go out/emerge/rise/come into view + \*-ḡ-”. If we want to express the same idea without the reflexive element, we can merely say: [fwḡ] as in BHeb. פוּג “to go out” above, orig. “to emerge” from a \*-ḡ-, or CA *fāḡa* from [fwḡ], etc.

8) The Egyp. cognate seems to be f’i ~ f’ “to lift up, start a journey”, caus. s-f’i “make to rise” (EHD I, 258; II, 664), Chad.: Kera *fe* “to fly, go up”, Mofu *paw* “to jump” (HSED, n. 787, 1911). The Egyp. root also expresses “to wake up from sleep” ~ p’i “to ascend, fly” (HED I, 234). It seems to me that Egyp. “wake up from sleep” is a natural development or extension of the notion “to rise”: comp. CA *nahāḡa* “to rise” > “to wake up from sleep”, etc. many similar examples can be cited.

9) Albright (JAOS, 47, 1927: 216, n. 35) considers Egyp *pw* (-t), expressing “sky, heaven” (EHD I, 229, 234), as originally signifying “horizon of heaven”, hence = BHeb. *pe’āh* “edge, corner, side, horizon”, Aram. *pâtâ* “edge, corner”. I add CA *fi’a-tu* “group (of army) that stay behind”, i.e. *back side of the army to protect them*, and also “category, group”; *fa’wu* “what is between two mountains”: *fa’ā* “to split, etc.” in the sense explained in n. ii below.

The meaning of Egyp. [pw, p-t] could be “edge or side of the sky” > “horizon”. This is clear in the Egyp. reduplicated p-t p-t “the two halves of heaven, the *day and the night* sky”, a picture of the intersection between *day-light* and *night* that can be seen for a few minutes when the sun sets or at dawn time. Viewing it from this angle may help us grasp

the meaning of CA fa'w<sup>143</sup> = "night". Thu Rummah, known as 'poet of the desert', says:

ḥattā 'infa'ā ('a)l fa'wu 'an 'a'nāḳiha saḥarā

The verse may render

«Until the darkness (night) is thinned out and revealed their necks at dawn time».

It appears that Egyp. and CA words denote the same natural phenomenon from two opposing 'time settings', the CA word seems to denote the apparent boundary between earth and sky seen at the end of night, while in Egyp. at the end of the daylight. Moreover, the proot is also seen in Egyp. word yfw in the compound *Res-yfw* "a dawn-god".

9a) To make certain that PHS \*faw- expresses "to rise, emerge or move in upward direction", it will be sufficient to consider the significations of some kindred compound trilaterals like [pwr], [pw'], etc .

The basic meaning of CA [fwr] is "to jet water, rise above the surface as boiling water, to effervesce, boil over, well forth", hence fawwāru "fountain", a compound of \*faw- + \*war-/ar- "water" (see §§2.17.59).

Another trilateral is [fw'] as in CA faw'a-tu "rise, beginning, first" (also [fwr] expresses "beginning, first"). In SL the basic meaning of fā' is "to rise", but it also denotes "to rise (from a natural position) + spread (in the sense 'become apparent')". It is related to [yf'] "to rise" in §2.12, 15, n. 4. In CA fau'a-tu (~ fau'a-tu) and faura-tu = "the start of, beginning of, first" and "rising". To my understanding, [fw] is the real proot underlying so many traditional trilaterals, including Semitic [pr'] "first".

9b) As for the trilateral [pwr], CA fyḏ is from \*fwd "to overflow, be superabundant; a flood, inundation"<sup>144</sup> as in the PIP of Imri' Al Qais:

«fa-fāḏa-t dumū'u ('a)l 'aini minnī ṣabābatan...» (DI, p. 10, L. 5).

BHeb. pwrš "to overflow, to be superabundant, of fountains", etc. see §§3.11.3 above.

The trilateral is again a compound of \*paw- plus \*-ḏ-. The radical \*-ḏ- is a reduced form of \*(W)ḏ- "stagnated water" also "pond, stream" as in CA 'adā-tu fem. id. The proot is also seen in numerous traditional roots.

9c) One of such roots is ḥawḏu "watering trough, basin, cistern, container of water". The trilateral is unquestionably a compound of ḥawā as in CA ḥawā "to have a content, have within, contain, enclose, surround; container", Sab. ḥwy "to encircle" (SD, 74), Egyp. ḥw-t "vessel", etc. and \*-ḏ- "water", which, when poured into the basin, it

<sup>143</sup> The word fa'wu expresses, according to Abu Layla (LA, r. f'w or f'y), "night". I believe that the original meaning of the word is "last portion of the night preceding saḥar or dawn, i.e. edge of the night, since fa'wu = 'inkišāfu, "uncovering, bringing to light", i.e. things become visible. In CA 'night', like any other natural phenomenon, is divided in parts, quarters, thirds, beginning or end of a part, etc., e.g. ṣasaḳu "beginning of the night", ḡawšu "from the first quarter of the night to its third", but it also denotes "heart of the night, i.e. midnight", 'unku ~ 'inku is according to one account "the last third of the night" and to another "the 2<sup>nd</sup> third", 'aḡūsu "the last hour of the night", and so forth.

<sup>144</sup> Aṣma'i (MA, 318-319) recognizes two roots [fyḏ, i.e. فيض] and [fwd, i.e. فاض]. Both express "to overflow".

naturally becomes “stagnated water”. Based on the analogy between ‘basin + stagnated or encircled water’ develops in CA ḥawdu “pelvis (of a woman), vagina”. It is most likely that CA ḥaidu “menstrual blood”, ḥā’idu, Sab. ḥyḏ “menstruating woman” (SD, 74) are from \*ḥwd rather than \*ḥyḏ (= \*ḥay- “live; life” + \*-ḏ- “water” and the meaning of ḥyḏ is orig. “water of life”).

10) In going back to \*fwr and \*fwd, we find that the words have been analyzed as compounds of \*fw-<sup>145</sup> “move in upward direction” plus \*-’r/-\*wr and \*-ḏ- “water” respectively. Now, take the proot \*γw-, the antonym of \*fw-, i.e. (move) *in downward direction*, and prefix it to proots \*-’r ~ \*-wr and \*-ḏ-, the resulting combinations give rise to trilaterals [γwr] & [γwḏ] respectively which express meanings opposite to those of [fwr] and [fwd] respectively: comp. CA yāra, said of water, (yauran and yu’ūran and yauwara) “go down into the bottom of the earth”, in the Koran: (إن أصبح ماؤكم غورا) (LA, r. γwr), yauru “bottom”, yāru “cave, cavern”, BHeb. ’wr “to excavate, dig”, m’rh, CA mayāra-tu “cavern” (OT, 762), Ug. myrt “cave” (UG, 531).

10a) As for [γw + -ḏ-] as in yāḏa = yāra above, i.e. *go down into the bottom of the earth (water)*” (Al ‘ayn IV, 430; LA) as in the Koran: (وغيض الماء), *And the water sank* (11: 44). I believe that CA γwṣ as in yāṣa “to plunge under water, submerge, sink” (Al ‘Ayn IV, 432), hence MSA yauwāṣa-tu “submarine”, BHeb. ’wṣ “to sink”, etc. are all variants of [γwḏ]<sup>146</sup>, whose meaning is self-explained. You may prefix, if you wish, a number of grammatical morphemes to \*-ḏ- to enrich the language with some new trilaterals as in [mwṣ], [hwṣ], [šwṣ] “to wash”, and so forth (see §2.10.31 above and §2.17.8 below). The trilateral [wḏ] as in waḏū’u “water”, perh. orig. “pure shining water” (just as *ḡarāḥu* “pure unmixed drinking-water” = perh. Akk. *ḡarāḥu* “sherbet”: cf. NWSI II, 1032), ta-waḏḏa’a “to perform the rite of ablution”. For its HS cognates, see §2.10.31 above.

10b) Another trilateral belonging here is PSem. \*γwl as in Sab. γyl “to flow; water course, covered channel” (SD, 54), CA yīlu lit. “water flowing on the face of the earth”; γailu “water-course, water flowing between trees”. According to LA (r. γyl), γailu “any place collecting water like a valley”. It is plainly evident that \*-Wl- is a proot for “flowing water” as in bīlu “river”, etc. (see §2.24.10), sailu “a great flow of water, flood, torrent”, Sab. s’yl “wadi-bed, water channel” (SD, 130), etc. It is possible that the original signification of \*γwl is “water below the surface”, since yā- or yaW= is clearly a proot for “below, underneath, down”.

Naturally, there is a close semantic relationship between “moving down into the bottom” and “hidden, covered”, with the latter being a natural development of the former, hence CA yā’ila-tu “hidden grudge”; yīlu “thicket that one can hide in it”; yīla-tu

<sup>145</sup> Among other traditional trilaterals based on \*paw- are CA fyš “inflate, swell out, bulge” = SL fwš “to swell out, expand, rise” = BHeb. pwš “be scattered, dispersed”, CA fwz “to win in a contest, rivalry, or competition, to triumph over”, etc.

<sup>146</sup> Both roots [γwḏ] and [γwṣ] are used metaph. in this line of Poet. and semantically extend to “sinks or slopes downward” and “perfidy rises and spreads” respectively:

γāḏa (‘a)l ḥayā’u wa fāḏa (‘a)l yadru wa’infaraḡat  
masāfatu (‘a)l ḥulfi baina (‘a)l ḡauli wa (‘a)l ‘amali.

“deceit, guile, fraud, stealth” Sab. *γyl* “ground-level structure)” (SD, 55) = BHeb. *’wl* “to give milk, to suckle” also “a child, a sucking-child, suckling” (OT, 758) = CA *γyl* id. The notion “suck” is from “extract (*mother’s milk* = *γailu*) from a hidden source, from an unseen place, from the bottom of”; *γāla*, said of a woman, “to suckle a child while she is pregnant”; hence, *mu-γyālu* ~ *mu-γālu* “sucking-child” as in the PIP of Imri’ Al Kaiys:

«...fa’alhaituhā ‘an dī tamā’imim muγyali».

As for the notion “child”, it is derived from the verb, and is conditioned in CA by the fact that the child’s mother has to be pregnant, i.e. *having unseen or hidden offspring; fetus or embryo*, hence CIV *’ayyala-t* (-t refers back to an ewe) “give birth to two in a year”. As a matter of fact, one of the two basic meanings of [*γyl*] is “a type of lactation”. Mand. *aula* “embryo, fetus” seems to belong here (MD, 10)<sup>147</sup>.

11) Before closing this section, I still have a few words to say about a derivative of CA [*γwr*] in (10) above. CA has several special terms for “*the sun*” in different positions in the sky and in different shapes. One of such terms is *γawra-tu* fem. denoting “a setting sun”, hence the verb *γāra* also denotes “to set (sun)”; *γiyāru* “setting of the sun”; CII *γauwara*, said of a man, “to lie down or take a nap at noon”, in so doing, «*as if he goes down to a low-lying place*», according to Bin Faris (ML IV, p. 562), since the verb expresses lit. “move in downward direction”. A possible HS cognate of this word is Eth.: Har. *īr* “sun”, S.W. ayr. Z. *ar-īt*, M., Go., Ms. *aret*, also Ge. *’er* id. However, Leslau (HED, 30-31) expresses the following view on the Ethiopic root:

*«It is difficult to know whether this root is borrowed from Cushitic (Sa., Af. ’yro ‘sun’, Qab. arrú, Tem. arri-cêcu) as suggested by Cerilli, Sidamo, 190, or whether it represents the Semitic Ethiopic root ’mr (Ge. ’amir “day, sun”, Gaf. aymärä) with weakened m».*

In an attempt to get out of this dilemma, and with ‘*little imagination*’, Leslau finds the solution and states:

*«Possibly the Semitic Ethiopic root /’mr/ was taken over as īr into Cushitic and then borrowed under this form by the various Semitic-Ethiopic languages including Hariri».*

A similar, though not identical, view is expressed by Cohen (DRS I, 24). The fact is that Ge. *’amir* “day, sun”, etc. could have developed from *’mr* “to see” > “visible” > “daylight, sun” or from *\*γawir*, and the interchanges of /w/ and /m/ and between them and /b/ and /p/ are not uncommon in all Semitic languages.

2.11.30 Phoen. *nšy* “to forget” (PG, 126), OAram. *nšy* id. (NWSI I, 764), Akk. *mašū*, Man. *nša* “to forget” (MD, 306), BHeb. *nšh* id., Eth. *nḥsy*, Syr. *nšy* id. (OT, 699), CA *nasiya* id. All are from [*šaW*], preserved intact in CA CIV *’a-swā* “forget”, and in BHeb.

<sup>147</sup> Gesenius connects BHeb. *’wl* with CA [*’yl* ~ *’wl*] as in *’āyil* “boy” (also *’ā’ila-tu* “family”; *’āla* “to feed one’s family”), DAram. *’l* “embryo, fetus” as in *’l rḥm* “the fetus in the womb” (NWSI II, 844). The corresponding CA phrase is *ḡanīn* (= fetus) [*fī* (= in) *’ar* (from *’al* “the”) *raḥm* (womb), where the term *ḡanīn* is also from the notion “be hidden, covered”.



šāyā [r. šyh] (OT, 1049).

I have to stress here that CA CIV 'aswā could be 'false CIV' (§3.21 below). If this view is correct then [nšy] itself also contains the neg. \*n- plus a proot \*šW- "know" (§2.6.8 above). For neg. [n], see §2.21.3 below.

For Eth. nḥsy, CA sahiya "to forget, neglect, lose memory of"; sahwu "forgetfulness" = BHeb. šhh (OT, 1049), etc. see §2.17.82 below.

**2.11.31** BHeb. nāšā(h) "to loan on interest, usury, to lend to any one money or other things, often on a pledge" ~ nāšā(') "to loan on usury" (OT, 699), CA nasa'a "to delay, to defer, postpone, esp. a loan, debt, usury" (LA), Sab. ns¹' "to defer, postpone" (SD, 98): PHS [ša'] "back, behind" as in Egyp. s'y "linger, lag"; s'y ywt-f "slow (as regards) his coming" (EG, 588).

**2.11.32** Ge. nādāfā "to hit, sting", Tna. nādāfā "to kick", Te. nādfa id., SE. ndf "sting", Har. nādāfa "sting, card wool", Cush.: Sa. nadaf (HED, 117), CA nadafa "to card cotton or wool", i.e. lit. "to beat", SL nadaf "to hit": PHS stem \*dap- "to beat, strike" as in Te., E., M., Ed. dāfdāfa "to beat clothes in washing", En., Gt. dāfādāfā "press down, squeeze together", etc. (HED, 54). For cognates in CA and other Semitic languages, see §2.4.14 above.

**2.11.33** CA CIV 'anšada [r. nšd] "to recite, declaim poetry, read poetry"; našīdu "declaiming poetry" = Egyp. šd "to read, recite, declaim poetry, strike up a tune" (EHD II, 759) = CA šadā "to chant, sing, celebrate in songs"; n. šadwu.

**2.11.34** OffAram. n'l "to enter, penetrate" (NWSI II, 737) = CA ḡalla, ta-ḡallala, "to enter, go in, penetrate"; CVII 'in-ḡalla "be penetrated", BAram., Syr. 'll "to go in, enter" (OT, 788), Nab., JAram. m'l "entrance", Palm. m'ln "entry" (NWSI II, 669-670).

1) The same stem is seen in CA with prefixed w- as in CV tawayḡala [r. wyl] "to penetrate deeply into", and with prefixed caus. [d-] in §2.1.6.5.13 above.

2) So many trilaterals, I believe, have been formed from \*ḡal- by the addition of affixes. But, as in any other case, it is almost impossible to establish such trilaterals without knowing the deep meaning of \*ḡal-. As a matter of fact, there are numerous words, like ḡalla, expressing "to enter, go in, penetrate" such as *daḡala*, *walaḡa*, *dalafa*, *ḡašša*, and so forth, with each having its distinctive meaning and etymology. The precise meaning of \*ḡal- is, to my understanding, neither to "enter, go in" nor "to penetrate", but rather centers round the notion "deep + into, i.e. into the inside, bottom, hence downward, as a root of tree penetrates so deeply into the bottom of the earth and a grudge into the heart and feeling of man. The word is certainly a compound of \*ḡaW- "down" plus \*-l- "into". When a thing is at the bottom or inside of something, it is naturally described or thought of as being covered/hidden/unseen, hence *dark*, *astray*, *rancor*, *calumny*, *wrong*, *treachery*, and the like as in ḡlk, ḡlf, ḡls, and so on. Many trilaterals and quadrilaterals beginning with ḡa(W)- actually revolve round such closely related notions.

**2.11.35** Sab. nsl “offspring of animal” (SD, 98) = CA naslu “progeny, offspring”. Both are based a stem \*sal- as in CA sulāla-tu fem. “progeny, offspring, descendants”. The stem will be studied in depth in §2.17.14 below.

**2.11.36** BHeb. nšl denotes: (a) “to draw out or off, to put off, e.g. a shoe” also (b) “to cast out, to eject a people from their land”, CA našala “to draw out” (OT, 700): PHS compound-word [n-] and stem [šal] as in CA šalā “to draw out, extract”; šāla ~ šalā “to raise, lift up” as in the PIP of Ubaid Bin Abraş:

«fa 'ištāla, wa ('i)rtā'a min ħabsin...» (ŠM, p. 109, L. 45), where ('i)štāla = raised (talking about a fox's tail), SA: Jib. sell “to drag away”, Chad.: Tangale sol “to pull”, Kirfi šollu, Angas šwl id., Mofu səl- id. (HSED, 2274).

The second meaning expressed by BHeb. = CA šalla “to compel or force to leave, *as people from their land or from a source of water*”, hence šilālu “scattered people”. PIP Labid says:

«...lā yahīmūna bi 'id'ākī ('a)š šalal».

To my knowledge, *forcing people to leave their land or home* is expressed by 'aġlā, while *forcing them to leave a source of water* is expressed by 'ašlā.

**2.11.37** Sab. nšĥ “disposition, organization, friendship” (SD, 100), BHeb. nešaĥ “sincerity, truth” also “splendor, glory” (OT, 689), CA nāšiĥu “one who advises”: našaĥa “to advise” našaĥ-tu-hu “I advised him”; nušĥu is the antonym of yiššu “fraud”, hence našaĥa also signifies “be pure” = Eth. nšĥ, BHeb. nāšaĥ, etc. see (OT, 688) = Ge., Tna. nəsuĥ “white”, Har. nāšĥ, Amh. nā, Gaf. nəşwā id., Cush.: Sa. nāšah, etc. (HED, 117) = For Sab. nšĥ above: cf. Sab. šĥ(ĥ) “keep in good order; good order” (SD, 142): PHS stem [šaĥ] < [daĥ]: see §2.11.24 above.

**2.11.38** BHeb. na'aşuş “thorn hedge, thicket of thorn”, BAram. nə'aş “to puncture, prick, stick”, CA nu'udu “a species of thorn” (OT, 679). These must be connected with CA 'adda “to bite”, Syr. 'şş “to compress (esp. the lips)”, Chad.: Sura, Angas at “to bite”, Dera a'ḏe “to eat”, Tangale 'eḏ-, Ngamo haḏ-, Kirfi aḏḏ-, Geruma aḏ- id., Kirfi haḏu, Fyer 'et “to eat” (HSED, n. 1039): PHS stem \*'id- as in CA 'iddu, 'idā'u, 'idāhu “thorny tree, hawthorn”. The proot \*'id- expresses in other Semitic languages “tree” as in Akk. iṣu, Ug. 'ş, BHeb. 'ēş, Eth. 'eḏ id. (Rabin, 1975: 89), Sab. 'ḏ “wood” (SD, 13), Phoen. 'ş id. (PG, 134).

a) As one may note, the proot \*'id- expresses in CA “thorny tree” but in other Semitic languages “tree; wood”. Which of these two significations is the earlier? As in almost every similar case, to Semitists the question is quite easy to answer; the signification of the trilateral in CA reflects *a secondary development*. Fronzaroli (1975: 49), following Nöldeke, writes:

*«Lexical comparison also demonstrates very clearly the existence of secondary developments in the Arabic Lexicon. We must here make a distinction between those secondary developments that are also found in other languages in the Southern area, and those found only in the Arabian area ... For example, 'id-, the generic*

*term for “tree”, has retained its meaning in South Arabian and Ethiopic, while in Arabic it came to denote the thorny trees that predominate in most part of Arabia (Nöldeke, 1910, 145)».*

One can plainly see throughout this chapter that CA has in nearly all cases retained the original meaning of every Semitic root. The meaning of the proot under discussion is not and will never be an exception, and Semitists’ theories, views, and assumptions on Semitic roots which are on the whole based on wrong understanding of Semitic have now no place in any scientific investigation. They are no more than shots in the dark; so that, if they hit the target once by chance they will miss it thousands of times. Nöldeke and Fronzaroli’s theory is based solely on *the datable records* of the languages involved. In accordance with this erroneous approach any meaning expressed by a CA word which is not identical with that of its cognate in older languages like Akk., Ug., etc. will often be referred to as ‘*secondary*’.

b) In lexicon comparison between related languages *the datable written texts* of each language are undoubtedly a factor that should be taken into account before assigning a meaning to a root. But this factor alone is by no means capable of bringing forth a valid and scientific reconstruction of roots and their meanings. By far the most important and reliable criteria are that the reconstructed proot must be capable of answering any question that may be raised concerning the proot and its relation to other possible roots found with it in the language (or language family), and that the meaning given to the proot must account for the meanings of all its supposed derivatives. As one may note, the meaning given to \*’id- is incapable of accounting for Heb.-Aram.-CA [n’š]. Nor is it capable of accounting for the close relationship that seems to hold between “thorny tree” and “bite”.

In accordance with the two scientific criteria just established above, PSem. \*’id-, originally referred to *a particular type of tree or plant ‘a thorny tree or plant’ as it still does only in CA*, has acquired a more general meaning over the course of time in all other Semitic languages. The original meaning is contained still in the triliteral [n’ḏ] above and also in some other trilaterals such as [m’ḏ] as in ma’ida “be angry from something you hear and find it painful and hurtful” (Al ‘Ayn I, 287), the more commonly used stem, according to Tha’lab (LA, r. m’ḏ), is CVIII ’imta’ada id. In MSA and dialects, CVIII is also the only one in frequent use, and its meaning may extend to “be angry from something you see and find it hurtful”. In SL the meaning of {’imta’ad} may be broken down- for the sake of illustration- into:

- a) You hear a (pinching) word (you don’t expect or like to hear), which (lit.) “bites you”.
- b) You feel that your feeling has been hurt,
- c) As a result, you get angry.

The BHeb. cognate is mā’aš *obsol.*; mā’aš “anger”, used as a pers. name Maaz (OT, 600), and is also seen in pers. name אהימאז Ahimaaz “brother of anger”. A parallel personal name is CA ḡadbānu Ghadban, i.e. ‘*angry*’, from ḡadiba “be angry”; ḡadabu “anger”, etc.

We can transpose the order of CA radicals [’ḏ] to [ḏ’] and get ḏa’a-tu fem. “a tree”, pl. ḏa’awātu, another is ḏi’a-tu “a kind of tree”, pl. waḏā’i’u., ta-’ḏūdu “a kind of dates”

(Al 'Ayn I, 72), *ṣadā* pl. “tree”.

**2.11.39** Ug. ngh “to shine” (UG, 535), BHeb. *nāḡah* “to shine, give light; shining, brightness”; BAram. ngh “the morning light, day-break” (OT, 646) also “dawn” (Rosenthal, 1963: 89), DAram. ngh “brightness, light” (NWSI II, 714), Mand., Syr., JAram. ngh “break of day, dawn, light” (MD, 297), Ge. ngh “to shine; light”, Chad.: Mandara *ṣṣya* id., Sokoro nogo “tomorrow” (HSED, n. 1895): PHS stem \**ḡah-* in CA CIV *’aḡhā* “to come into view, become visible, bring to light”; *muḡhā* “open to view, uncovered”, Syr. *ḡahḡah* “to dawn”, Mand. *maḡha* (\**magha*) id., Ge. *ḡahəha* id., etc. see §2.12.8 below and also §2.4.16, esp. ft <sup>1</sup> above.

**2.11.40** OffAram., JAram. *nḥm* “councilor, legal assistant, supporting witness in legal action” is considered a loanword from Egyp. *nḥm* “to protect, save” (NWSI II, 725): PHS \**ḥam-* “to protect, save” as in Sab. *yḥtmynn* imperfect pl. “safeguard”; *ḥmyt* “protector” (SD, 69) = CA *ḥāmiyatu* “garrison, i.e. *one that protects*”; *ḥamā* “to protect, defend”; *ḥāmī* “protector”; *ḥimā* “protected place” = OCan., Moab. *ḥmt* “fortress, wall” (NWSI I, 381).

**2.11.41** BHeb. *nāḥaṣ* “to urge, press”, CA *naḥada* id. (OT, 665): PHS stem [*ḥaḍ*] “to press, urge” as in CA *ḥadda* “to urge, press, incite”: see §2.15.29, n. b below.

**2.11.42** Phoen., OAram., Samal *nṣb* “raised stone; stele”, OffAram., DAram., Pun. *nṣb* “to erect, raise”, Palm., Nab. *nṣbh* “raised stone” (NWSI II, 750-751), BHeb. *nāṣab* “to set, put to place; to stand”; *Hiph.* “cause to stand; set up, erect” (OT, 687), CA *naṣaba* “to erect, raise, set up a monument”; CVIII *’intaṣaba* “to stand erect, stand up”; *nuṣbu* “idol, statue, memorial stone”, pl. *’anṣābu* as in the PIP of Nabīyah:

«...wa mā hurīḡa ’alā (’a)l *’anṣābi* min ḡasadi» (ŠM, p. 95, L. 37).

Sab. *nṣb* “to set up, place a monument” as a noun “image of person, memorial stone” with *mṣbt* “pillar” (SD, 99) = BHeb. *mṣbh*, Phoen. *mṣbt* “pillar” (PG, 125), Palm., Nab. *mṣb* (NWSI II, 675), CA *nuṣba-tu* id., Tham. *nṣb* “dresser, ériger”, subst. “stèle” (Branden, 1950: 515).

1) The trilateral [*nṣb*] is ultimately from \**ṣW-*, perh. becoming first \**ṣab-* and later [*nṣb*]. The first stage of development has been preserved in Hamito-Semitic (see 1b below). As for the second stage, \**ṣab-* “raised place”, preserved in SL in a proverb «*’ahl l-’ubbi* ~ *’ibbi* (from *ḡubba-ti* “dome”) *wa ṣ-ṣubbi* (from *ṣubba-ti*)», connoting “higher class (of people); elevation”, and in CA in the trilateral [*ṣṭb*] as in *miṣṭaba-tu* “Mastaba, i.e. *terrace in front of a house and is higher than the level of ground, stone bench for sitting on*”. Infixed *-ṭ-* is from CVIII \**’i-ṣṭabba* > *’i-ṣṭabba*, where \**-t-* becomes emphatic \**-ṭ-* by assimilation to the preceding emphatic /*ṣ-*/. This is a rule in the language that admits no exceptions.

1a) The proot \**ṣW-* is seen in Egyp. *ḍww* “mountain” (EHD II, 904), BHeb. *ṣāwā* “to erect, to place” also “to institute, appoint” as in Ps 7, 7, Is. 45, 12, etc.; *ṣṣ* “cippus”, in Syr. “to set up a monument” (OT, 886), Pun. *ṣw’yt* perh. “tomb-stone, memorial” (NWSI II, 964), CA *ṣuwwa-tu* “cippus” also “sign-stone (like a minaret) placed in the

desert to guide people” as in the PIP of Labid:

«...šādirin wahmin šuwāhu ḡad maḡal» (DL, p. 143, line 5).

The word also denotes “hill, hillock” as in the PIP of Imri’ Al Qais:

«wa habbat lahu rīḡun bimūḡtalafī (ʿa)ṡ šuwā...» (DI, p. 160, L. 5).

The notion “to appoint” as expressed by the BHeb. verb above is expressed in CA by CII naṡṡaba [nṡb] and never by [ṡw-].

1b) The same proot is also seen in CA naṡaʿa “to raise, elevate” as in the PIP of Ṭarfah:

«ʿamūnu kaʿalwāḡḡi (ʿa)l ʿirāni naṡʿ-tu-hā  
ʿalā lāḡibin.....»

2) One may prefix n- to \*ṡW- and the result is a new trilateral [nṡw] or [nṡy] (ML V, 433; LA) expressing as in naṡiyya-tu “the heads of a tribe, nobility”; nāṡiya-tu “locks of hair hanging over from the forehead, forehead where the hair grows” also “feathers, plume of birds”, Akk. nāṡu “feather”, BHeb. nōṡa(h) “pinion of birds”: nāṡā(h) “to fly, to flee” (OT, 687-688). Here belong Ge. nāṡāyā “to pluck” and Tna. nāṡāyā, etc. (HED, 117). A trilateral [ʿnṡ] is found in CA and expresses “lock of hair” as in ʿunṡuwa-tu (Al ʿAyn I, 304). For proot [ʿ-], see §2.14.1, n. i below.

3) Moreover, the complete assimilation of \*-W- to the preceding \*ṡ- in \*nṡW-, gives rise to an additional trilateral [nṡṡ] or [nṡ] (ML V, 356) as in CA nuṡṡa-tu fem. “the hair hanging over the forehead”; naṡṡa “to lift, elevate”; CVIII ʿintaṡṡa = ʿintaṡaba above.

### Comments

Knowledge of the true underlying phonological and semantic structures of a Semitic proot and of late PHS phonological system makes it easy for a student of Hamito-Semitic linguistics to trace back to a single proot all trilaterals which have developed from it in the course of time by means of affixes or compounding.

For example, CA ṡabbara “to heap” in the sense *put things above one another so as to make a high heap of* or ṡubba-tu fem.”. The term also expresses “to gather”, i.e. *gather things and place above one another*; ṡubra-tu “a heap of”; ṡabīru “mountain” ~ ḡabara “to gather, heap” in the sense of making things into ʿidbāra-tu = ʿidmāma-tu (§2.12.16 below); ḡibāra-tu “community”; ḡabāʿiru “groups of people” (= ṡubba-tu “a group between 20 and 40”), etc. dial. ṡabbūr “heap of > group of”.

BHeb., BAram. ṡbr “to heap up” (OT, 881). The trilateral [ṡbr] exists in SL and expresses the same meaning as that of CA, while [ḡbr] is not very much common. Instead of it, we use ḡabb “to gather, collect”. It goes without saying that \*ṡ- in all trilaterals cited above is from an original \*ḡ-, and in nearly all cases CA has preserved the form with both the original /ḡ/ and its variant /ṡ/, e.g. CA also has ḡuwwa-tu (see n. 1a above).

**2.11.43** CA nafara “to swell”, Eth. nafara, Aram. nepar “to boil, swell” (Albright, JAOS 47, 1927: 220, n. 48): PHS stem \*par- (see §2.3.13, n. 2 above).

**2.11.44** OffAram. npy “to sift, sieve” (NWSI II, 741), BHeb. napa(h), CA nafafa “to sift”, nuḡāya-tu “refuse, waste or worthless matter left after sifting”, Ge., Tna. nāḡāyā “to

sift”, Te. nāfa, Amh. nāffa, Z. nāfa, Har. Har. nāfa “sift”; wanfit “sieve”, Ge. mänfe, Tna. mänfit, Amh., Gt. manfit id. (HED, 117, 160): PHS \*paW- (see §2.2.30 above).

**2.11. 45** BHeb. ngš “to touch” (OT, 649) seems to be an old *Niph.* stem = CA CVII \*(‘i)nġassa “be touched with the hand”: PHS stem \*gas- “to touch; hand” as in CA ġassa “to touch with the hand”; maġassu, maġassa-tu “anything touched by the hand”, BHebr. gšš “to feel, to grope for”, NHeb. gāšaš “to touch (also to join)”, OffAram. hgšš “to spy”, Jp. gəšaš “to touch, to feel”, Syr. gaš “to touch, to examine”; gašgeš “to feel”, Mand. gaš “to touch, to feel”, Ge. gasasa “to touch, feel”, Te. gässä “to wipe with the hand”, etc. (DRS III, 197).

For various related meanings expressed by Semitic languages: cf. CA ġassa also “to examine, grope for, feel (for), to test, to experiment, gaze sharply into s.th. in an attempt to comprehend it or recognize it, etc.”; taġassasa “to spy”; ġāsūsū “a spy”. The derivative ġāssa-tu denotes “any of the five senses: *the two eyes, two hands, mouth, smell, and touch*, pl. ġawāssu. This term should be kept distinct from *hāssa-tu* “any of the five senses of *hearing, sight, smell, touch, and taste*”; pl. hawāsu. Farāhīdī, however, considers both terms as variants of one form, while Ibin Sidihi regards the former as a variant of the latter (LA). I have already drawn attention to the unjustifiable interchange of /g/ and /h/ (see §2.10.14, *Comments II*).

**2.11.46** Egyp. caus. s-nktkt “to shake, agitate” (EHD II, 678), CA nakata “to throw away, throw headlong; to beat the ground with a stick” also “to spear or stab someone and throw him off his horse” (see §2.2.57.7 above), in *Hadith* “to think”, SL nakkat (said of carpet, etc.) (= Egyp. s-nktkt = “to shake, shake off”), and is used interchangeably with katt (said of carpet) id. also “to go fast or run from a higher place to a lower place or in downward direction”. Thus the /n-/ is clearly a prefix in both Egyp. and CA. The verb nakkat also signifies “tell jokes”: CA nakata “to think” above. All are from a stem \*kat- (see below), and CA nakata “to think” is also from \*kat- as in katta “to calculate, reckon, count”. Some derivatives of \*kat- are: Cop. gotget “to break” = BHeb. kātāt “to beat, to beat down, to hammer, rout an enemy” also “break”, CA CIV ’aktā “to have the upper hand over an enemy”; CXII ’iktautā “to stir, to shake”; kattu “rage, fury, boiling” (LA), Amh. katakkata “to break” (OT, 498; EHD II, 799; VPHS, 113, n. 175).

b) Egyp. ktkt “to walk with short quick steps” (EHD II, 799) = CA katkata-tu “walking with short quick steps” as a vb ta-katkata<sup>148</sup>; katītu “walking gently or slowly”, also katwu “walking with short steps”. With prefixed /w-/: wakata “to walk with short and heavy steps” (LA), Tham. kty “marcher à petits pas” (Branden, 1950: 514), Chad.: Mibi kāt “to go, go out”, Birgit kaati id., Housa katākātā “first efforts of a child to walk”, Kwang kote “to follow”, Cush.: Oromo kaat “to run”, Mocha kaata- “to hurry” (HSED, n. 1439).

(c) Egyp. ktkt “to stammer, stutter” (EHD II, 799) = CA katkata “to repeat words or utterances again and again in order to make the hearer hear and understand them”.

<sup>148</sup> In SL you walk in this way when one goes down from upper (e.g. a hill) to lower.

(d) Egyp. kt “be little, small” = Akk. katū, CA ktt “meager”, Chad.: Sura, Mupun kat “small” (VPHS *ibid.*; HSED, n. 1438).

(e) The root \*kat- is seen in a number of trilaterals. One of them is [ktš], where PHS caus. \*/š/ is used as a suffix; another is in CA sakata “be silent”; sākitu “silent” (§2.2.56.4, ft <sup>1</sup> above)

**2.11.47** BAram., Syr., Sam. ngb “to be dry, be dried up”, CA nağafa in CVIII ‘intağafa, said of a cow’s udder, “to milk to excess, i.e. *to extract all the milk from it, make empty of*, said of the wind, “to empty the ground of dust” ~ [gnb], from \*ngb, by metathesis, as in ġannaba, said of sheep, she-camel, etc. “give no milk”; tağnību “droughty year”; ġanūbu “the south; hot south wind” = BHeb. negeb id., both are from the notion “dryness” (OT, 644).

All are from a stem \*gap- ~ \*gab- “be dry” as in CA ġaffa id.; ġafāfu “dryness” ~ ġabābu “extreme drought, aridity”, Eth.: Te. gābbā “become poor”, gāb belā “be starving” (DRS II, 94).

**2.11.48** Ug. n’r “boy” (UG, 531), Phoen., EHeb., Amm. n’r “young boy; servant” (NWSI II, 739), CA nu’ra-tu [n’r] “child” also “fetus” in a proverb «mā ħamalat ‘al mar’atu nu’ratan qaṭṭ» (LA, r. n’r): CA ‘arru “young boy” (Al ‘Ayn I, 86); ‘urā’iru, by reduplication, “master”, pl. ‘arā’iru, perh. Egyp. ‘rw “child” (EHD I, 130).

**2.11.49** BHeb. nā’ar “to roar”, Syr. n’r id. (OT, 679), OffAram. n’r “to bray (said of an ass)” (NWSI II, 739), CA na’īru “clamor, as *in wars*”: PHS stem \*’ar- as in CA ‘ar’āru “loud shouting”; ta-’āru “The state of sleeplessness accompanied by turning from one side to another in bed and uttering audible sounds” is derived, according to Farāhīdi (Al ‘Ayn I, 86) from ‘urāru “the sound, esp. made by a male ostrich” as in the PIP of Labid:

«taḥammala ‘ahluḥā ‘illā ‘urāran  
wa ‘azfan ba’da’aḥyā’in ḥilālī»

The stem seems to be related to \*’ar- “to rise, shake, agitate” (see §2.11.19, etc. above), hence, EHeb. n’r *Niph.* “be moved, shaken” (NWSI II, 739).

**2.11.50** CA [nḵd] ‘anḵada (~ ‘anḵaḍa), preserved only in the proverb: «bāta bi lailihi ‘anḵada», where ‘anḵada, means “spending the night awake, sleepless”<sup>149</sup>. Its Egyp. cognate is nḵdd “to sleep”, n’ḵdīd, Copt. enkot id. (EHD I, 344, 396, Hodge; 1975: 181), obviously a compound of \*n- and \*ḵad-: cf. Egyp ḵdī also “to sleep”; ḵd-t “sleep” (EHD

<sup>149</sup> The word ‘anḵada also denotes “hedgehog”, so-called from ‘*spending the night awake*’ (Jamharh II, 677; ML V, 467; LA). It appears that there is a very close semantic connection between “night” and “hedgehog”. Some examples are: duḡḡa-tu “intensive darkness”; daḡūḡu “dark (night)”; daḡdaḡa, tadaḡdaḡa “become dark (night)” > mudaḡdaḡu “hedgehog”, ‘as’asa “to come (of night), begin to be dark, bring its darkness (night)” as in the Koran (والليل إذا عسعس) > ‘asā’isu, pl. “hedgehog”, darūmu “going back and forth at night” > darima-tu “hedgehog”, duldulu “hedgehog”, so-called because it moves back and forth at night, darraḡu “hedgehog”, so-called because *it spends the night going back and forth* (LA), and so forth.

II, 780). Egyp. initial /n-/ is a proot by itself from \*nW-, and may signify “time” as in Egyp. nw “time”, Cop. naw id. In accordance with this view, the original signification of the word may be “time to sleep”. On the other hand, CA ’anḳada may be from either:

a) A compound of three elements: \*’- “not, no” (see §2.21.3.1 below), \*-n- “time” (cf. CA ’ān “it is time”), and \*ḳad- “to sleep”. With this analysis, the meaning of ’a-n-ḳada becomes “not time to sleep” > n-ḳada “time to sleep” (= Egyp. nḳdd) “time to sleep”: \*ḳad- ~ \*ḳaḏ- (= Egyp. ḳd) “to sleep”.

b) Another plausible analysis of the CA word is a compound consisting of ’an- “not” (cf. CA ’nn, ’ny “not, no”, etc. see §2.21.3 below) and \*ḳad- “to sleep”. In accordance with this analysis, the meaning of the compound is “not to sleep ~ spend the night awake”.

1) One may argue (Vycichl, 1975: 209), however, that the real Semitic cognate form of Egyp. nḳdd “to sleep” is the root in CA raḳada “to sleep, lie down”.

CA [rqd] has two different origins, which express two contradictory meanings:

(a) “be in a state of physical rest or condition of inactivity, i.e. *to lie down*”;

(b) “be in motion, i.e. *to move*”.

CIV ’arḳada and CXI ’irḳadda “to hasten, hurry”, *from fear* = BHeb rāḳad Poet. “to dance, leap, skip”, *also things are said to leap or skip from fear* (OT, 996), Phoen. rḳd “to dance, skip” (PG, 147), Akk. raḳādu, JAram., Syr. rḳd, Mand. rḳuda “to dance; jump” (MD, 437), Sab. rḳd “to traverse” (SD, 117).

To the semantic rubric ‘*move*’ also belong Ug. rḳṣ “to fly”, CA raḳaṣa “to dance”. It seems that [rḳd] and [rḳṣ] are both from Semitic \*rḳḏ, a trilateral impossible to pronounce. Try to pronounce \*raḳaḏa, you find that you can’t; instead, you pronounce rakada “move, run, etc.”. The initial [r-] seems to be a proot and notion of ‘dance’ is expressed by \*ḳad ~ ḳaṣ.

### Comments

d) For what concerns *raḳada*, its signification as cited in CA dictionaries is “to sleep (perh. *at night*)”. To my understanding, however, there is a marked difference in meaning between *nāma*, the CA and gen. HS word for “to sleep”, and *raḳada*. The verb signifies “be still, lie down, etc. above” and this signification is close to that of rakada “be or become dull, inactive, to stagnate, as a *market, water*, etc.” (LA).

e) In going back to [n-ḳd], we should expect other grammatical prefixes to be added to [-ḳad]. To find such trilaterals one has to take into consideration the phonotactics of the language. CA does not permit a sequence \*/hḳd/ or a sequence \*/’ḳd/. Accordingly, the addition of caus. /h- ~ ’-/ to form CIV verbs and nouns would necessarily bring about a phonetic change in the prefix or in the stem. This may explain the change of /-ḳ-/ into /-ḡ-/ as /h-/ is prefixed to the proot, hence haḡada “to sleep *at night*” (Al ‘Ayn I, 98) as in the PIP of Labid:

«ḳāla haḡḡidnā fa ḳad ṭāla (’a)s surā...».

«...wa ḡḡšin bi ’a’lā ḡī ṭuwālat huḡḡada».

The prefix /h-/ is definitely from an earlier /’-/ , and there are two weighty reasons for this assumption:

1. One can say haḡada, but cannot say \*’aḡada.



2. It is \*ʾ- which is also used as a neg. prefix (§2.21.1 below) and not \*h-, hence haġada also denotes “not to sleep, stay awake” as in the Koran: (ومن الليل فتهجد) and in Poet.:

«bi sairin lā yunīhu (ʾa)l ʕaumu fihi

li sāʾāti (ʾa)l karāʾillā *huġūdā*» (Siġistāni, Kitāb Al Addād, n. 77).

d) There are wheighty reasons preventing me from considering /-d/ a constituent part of the proot. One of such reasons is the existence of ʾariḡa “be sleepless, not to sleep”. Other reasons revolve round the fact that there are other trilaterals beginning with [hg-] and express a similar meaning. One is [hġʾ] as in haġaʾa. It is amazing that one can replace initial /h-/ with /ḡ-/ and get a new trilateral ḡaġaʾa “to lie down or sleep on one’s side”; CVIII ʾidṡaġaʾa (from \*ʾidṡaġaʾa) or in some old dialects ʾilṡaġaʾa<sup>150</sup>. One can also replace medial /-ġ-/ with /-k-/ or with /-ḡ-/ as in §§2.4.7- 8 above, etc.

**2.11.51** Assy. naḡū “to pour out a libation”; niḡū “libation; offering” (King, 1898: 370), JAram. nḡy “pure”, OffAram. nḡy “to clean, clear; be innocent; purification; libation”, Pun. nḡy “purification” (NWSI, II, 756f), BHeb. nḡh “be clean, pure”, Syr. nḡy “to sprinkle for purification, pour out a libation, sacrifice” (OT, 692), CA naḡiy “pure, clean”; naḡḡā “to clean, purify”; ʾintaḡā “to select the best of”; nuḡāw-atu ~ nuḡāy-atu “the best of anything”<sup>151</sup> (Al ʾAyn V, 219). The exact antonym of the last cited word is nufāy-atu “the bad of anything”<sup>152</sup>.

The proot underlying [nḡy] is also seen with prefixed /ʾ-/ in CA [ʾnḡ] “clean, tidy”, etc. (see §2.3.18 above), as well as with medial -w- [nwḡ] as in CV tanauwaḡa = CV taʾannaḡa of [ʾnḡ] = do (a thing) accurately, be elegant”.

To my understanding, the trilaterals are related to those in §2.12.17 below.

**2.11.52** Egyp. nms “to come”, Akk. namāšu “to move, start” (HSED, n. 1903) also “to depart” (AG, 90): CA mašā “to walk, move”, etc. see §2.15.19 below.

**2.11.53** Sab. [nwḡ] in nḡt-m “mourning, bereavement” (SD, 101), CA nāḡa [r. nwḡ] “make mournful outcry, lament, bewail”, nawḡu, manāḡa-tu-n “lamentation, mourning, wailing”. All are from the root in CA ʾiḡāʾu “weeping, crying”. The imperfect of the root is seen in Poet.: yūḡī “cause to weep” = yanūḡu, the imperfect of nāḡa, according to LA (r. nwḡ).

Egyp. wḡ “to cry out” is certainly cognate with CA wāḡā “to reveal a secret, to utter a sound or noise”; waḡā “sound, voice” also “master or lord” ~ waḡwaḡu “master or lord;

<sup>150</sup> The lateral /l/ can interchange position with /ḡ/ since it is “the closest consonant in the language to /ḡ/”, i.e. bearing close phonetic similarities to /ḡ/ (ṢḤḤ III, 1248; Sibawayh, Al Kitāb II, 429).

<sup>151</sup> The same /nu-/ is present in *nuḡba-tu* id. (from hW- “good”: cf. §2.19.1 below) “the best of” = *niḡhu* from niḡwā “the best of”.

<sup>152</sup> CA *nuḡāwatu* can also express a contradictory meaning; “bad of anything”. Jawhari assumes that the word expresses ‘the bad of anything’ except for the dates (LA, r. nḡy). The /n-/ here is a negative element (§2.21.3 below).

strong” (= Egyp. wḥ “be strong”); CA waḥwaḥa “to utter a sound, a cry”; waḥwāḥu adj. describing a dog “barker, barking dog = Egyp. wḥwḥ “to bark, cry out” (EHD I, 177-178), Har. wuḥ bāya “to bark (dog), Te. wəḥ bela, Tna. wəḥ bālā, Amh. wualā, etc. id. Leslau, HED, 158. For the ultimate origin of the root, see §2.1.14.1, *Comments* I above.

For the signification of proot [na-] in [nwḥ] and in many other trilaterals, see §2.11.63, under *Comments* below.

**2.11.54** BHeb. nāḥam expresses “to pant; to lament, grieve”, CA naḥima “to groan, pant” (OT, 664), Egyp. nḥm “to cry out; lament, cry” (EHD I, 385): PHS \*waḥ- (see §2.11.53 above). Also belong here Egyp. nḥmy “a kind of bird” = CA nuḥāmu “a kind of bird”, described in LA (r. nḥm) as *a red bird resembling a goose*, with b-ext.: CA naḥaba “to lament audibly, weep loudly”. In other words, if “outcry, lamentation” is loud and audible, then [nḥb] is to be used.

**2.11.55** Sab. ngw “to announce to s.o, to intimate” (SD, 93), CA naḡwā “talking to oneself, soliloquy”; nāḡā “to commune with oneself, talk to oneself”, Chad.: sokoro “to shout”, etc. are based on PHS proot [gaW] “voice, sound” in §3.11.58 below.

**2.17.65** Assy. nagāgu “to cry, to bellow” (King, 1898: 366), in Akk. “to cry”, CA reduplicated naḡnaḡa “(to lead astray) with words or speech”, Egyp. ngg “to cry (of a goose)”, Chad.: Glv nggw “to answer”, Sokoro negi “to shout” (HSED, n. 1854): PHS proot [gaW] (§2.11.58 below)

**2.11.57** CA na’aḡa جأ “to shout, make a sound, to scream, to supplicate with a sad voice (human being)” also “make a hoarse sound, as an owl”; na’iḡu “voice, sound”. It is also said «*ḡaurun* (= bull) *na’āḡu*» “lowing loudly and frequently”. The word na’āḡu جأ may also be said of man and expresses “loud voice”, perh. after the characteristic sound made by *a bull*. The trilateral [n’g] is perh. present in Egyp. [n’gg’] “to cackle (of geese)” (EHD I, 348) also [ngg], [ng’g’], which can be reduced to [ng], “to cackle” (EHD I, 398).

CA [n’ḡ] is a compound of \*na’- and \*gaW (§2.11, n. 6 above).

**2.11.58** Ug. g “voice” (UG, 537): PHS proot [gaW] as in Egyp. g’ “sing” (EHD I, 800), Chad.: Bata goo “to sing”, Cush.: Oromo go’a “moan” (HSED, n. 936), SL ža’ž’ “to gossip”, Soq. ge’ge’ “mugir” (DRS II, 92). Here also belong Te. 273epe’ä “bégayar”, Amh. tän-gaga “résonner” (DRS II, 98), and perh. Syr. guwāḡā “gémissment”; gawḡi “babillage d’enfants, pépiements d’oiseaux”, Ge. gugā, Amh. guggut “hibou, chouette” (DRS II, 105). The same proot has also been preserved in CA ’aḡḡa , with caus. /’a-/, “make a sound”.

1) PHS [gaW] underlies a very large number of trilaterals and quadrilaterals in its various dialects. Even roots like [rgm], [trg], [trgm], and so many others (§§2.7.9-10 above) are based on it. It appears that /-m/ was suffixed to \*gW- much earlier than the prefix /r-/; cf. Ug. gm “à voix haute”, Ge. gumā “son doux et mélodieux” (DRS II, 92) = CA reduplicated form ḡamḡama “speak incoherently”; ḡamḡama-tu “incomprehensible

speech”. Some other affixes added to \*gaW- to form new roots are:

1a) Suffixed -l: Ug. gl “voice” (UG, 537) = CA reduplicated form ḡalḡala “to resound, to peal; to thunder”. Also, consider CA ḡalaba-tu “tumult, uproar”, Har. ḡalḡēb “conversation”, Cush.: Som. ḡalbeb “conversation” (HED, 71).

1b) By shifting the radicals of [gl], we get a new root as in CA laḡḡa-tu fem. “voice, sound”; CVIII ’iltaḡḡa “make a sound”. By the addition of proot \*-b- = *high, audible, strong* & the like: laḡabu = ḡalaba-tu “tumult, uproar” above; as a verb laḡaba, as in the PIP of Zuhair Bin Abi Salama:

«ʿazizun ’idā ḡalla (ʿa)l ḡalīfāni ḡawlahu  
biḡl laḡabin laḡḡātuhu wa ṣawāhiluh» (LA).

1c) If [laḡ] is 274epeated, we will get laḡlaḡa “to stammer”, JAram., Syr., Nheb. Lglg id., Mand. lag id. (MD, 227).

1d) Suffixed /-ʿ/: Ug. gʿ-t “mugissement”, BHeb. gāʿā “to low, as an ox or cow” (OT, 200), Aram., Syr., Jp. gāʿā “to cry, howl”, Mand. gha id. (DRS III, 164; MD, 72). In CA the root is also seen in a reduplicated form ḡaʿḡaʿa “to bluster, make confused noise”; ḡaʿḡaʿu, said of a male animal (like bull, camel, etc.) “lowing to excess”, Soq. geʿgeʿ “meuglement” (DRS III, 163).

1e) One can shift the order of radicals [gʿ] and get a new root [ʿg] as in CA ʿaḡḡu “raising of the voice”, Chad.: Kwang ʿoge “to call”, Tumak wəg, Sibine ʿwaga id. (HSED, n. 1107), a compound of [ʿaʿ] and [gaW].

1f) To PHS \*gaW- also belong Chad.: Housa gaya “to tell”, Tera ga “to speak”, Cush.: sherko ge “to say”, Dime gee-mu, Gollango gay, Ari gai- id. (HSED, n. 911).

1g) Caus. h- can be prefixed to \*g- as in CA haḡhaḡa ~ harraḡa “yell at, be noisy” (MA, 403).

1h) Caus. š- can also be prefixed to \*gal- (1a above) as in Har., Gaf. sāḡälä n. “sound”, Cush.: Ga. sāḡäle, Had. sagāra (HED, 138), perh. CA zaḡala “yell at”; zaḡal “a dialectal type of spontaneous debate in poetry between two or more”.

**2.11.59** Ug. nhḡt “braying” (UG, 531), Assy. nāḡu “to lament, wail” (King, 1898: 370), BHeb. nāḡaḡ “to bray”, CA nahaḡa, BAram. nhḡ id. (OT, 654), Ge. nhḡ “to cry, shout”, Meh. nehēḡ “to bray”.

In SL the verb nahaʿ (i.e. nahaḡ) is used and expresses an identical meaning, but the more widely used word is šanhaʿ (i.e. šanhaḡ) id., which is not a blend of šahaʿ “to whoop; a loud cry” and nahaʿ, but rather from šahaʿ with infix /-n-/, because we also say šahšaʿ “to sob with a deep and quick sound made while breathing in”: cf. CA šahaḡa “to whoop, cry noisily” and also “to bray noisily or loudly (an ass)”; šahīḡu, when followed by ḡimār (= donkey, ass) = آخر صوته i.e. *its last braying*. It should be remembered, however, that šahīḡu = inhalation”; šahaḡa “to inhale” also “make a short, deep, and quick sound while breathing in”, as when one is severely choked or suddenly sees something dreadful<sup>153</sup>, Tna. haḡw “cri, bruit de suffocation” (DRS V, 444).

<sup>153</sup> It is semantically close to the notion ‘death-rattle’, which is expressed by ḡaṣraḡa-tu fem., i.e. ḡaṣar- (for its signification, see §2.1.6.7, n. 6b above) plus ga- “sound”.

To my understanding, /haḵ/ here describes “a noise or sound produced in or coming out from the throat and accompanied by rapidly raising the pharynx (to compress the ingressive air in the mouth) and stretching the neck”, and is from a proot \*ḵ-.

**2.11.60** CA naḵḵa, said of a frog, partridge, vulture, hen, and ostrich “to cackle, croak” (> “to nag”) is from \*n- plus \*-ḵ(W)- as in CA ḵāḵa “to cackle” (usu. ostrich) as in the PIP of Nābiyah:

«... na‘āmūn ḵāḵā fī baladin ḵifāri»,

ḵayḵu ~ ḵawḵu ~ ḵaḵwu, said of a hen “cackle when it is in rut, ḵāḵu, ḵūḵu “a water-foul”, BHeb. ḵā‘at, Syr., Targ. ḵḵ’ id. (OT, 907f), Oakk. nwḵ “to lament” (Gelb, 1961: 178, but see nhḵ above), Har. ḵāḵ- “cackle (hen when she stops laying eggs)”, Te. ḵaḵ bela, Tna. ḵāḵāwa, Gt. ankaka(m), etc., Cush.: Bed. kuk, Had. kākke-sā-kho, Kam. kākka-so’ (HED, 127). Also belong here Akk. ḵaḵū “bird”, Egyp. ḵ‘ḵ “to cry out” (SL ka‘ka’, said only of hen, “cackle”), ḵḵ “cuckoo”, Chad.: Fyer kukwe “rooster”, Gulfey kwaku “hen” (HSED, n. 1539).

**2.11.61** CA nayaḵa “to croak, to crow” as in the PIP of Zuhair:

«’amsā biḵāka yurābu (’a)l baini ḵad nayaḵa».

There is no difference in meaning between nayaḵa and na‘aḵa, and the only one in use in modern times is the latter. Farāhīdī (Al ‘Ayn IV, 355) derives [nyḵ] from the sequence yīḵ yīḵ (of imitative origin) *the shrill cry characteristic of a crow*; yāḵu “crow”. Cognates may be Chad.: Mubi gak, Bidiya gaaga, Kwang gāga “crow”, Mofu man-gahak, Dghwede ḡaga “crow”, Gisiga mu-ghak, Logone ḡake, Buduma nḡage id., (HSED, n. 1003).

a) On the other hand, na‘aḵa also expresses “to yell, shout” = za‘aḵa id., OCan., OffAram., Targ., Syr. z‘ḵ “to cry” (NWSI I, 337; DRS VIII, 772), BHeb. zā‘aḵ “to cry out, exclaim”; *Niph.* “to cry out; make an outcry; to call unto any one; to call upon, to invoke” (OT, 285), BAram. z‘ḵ “to shout, to call” (Rosenthal, 1963: 83).

It is possible that initial z- is the same as that in §2.23.8, n. 1 below and stem [‘aḵ] is a term for “crow”.

b) CA ṣa‘aḵa, said of a bull, “to low very loudly”; ṣa‘iḵa “to cry out for terror”; ṣa‘iḵu “loud and intense sound; loud outcry” as in the Poet. of Ru‘bah:

«’iḵā tatallāhunna ṣaṣālu (’a)ṣ ṣa‘aḵ» (LA).

BHeb. ṣā‘aḵ “to cry out, cry out to any one, to exclaim, to implore” (OT, 900), OffAram. ṣ‘ḵ “to cry” (NWSI II, 971), JAram. ṣ‘ḵ “to call”, Berb.: Kabyl cewweḵ “to sing”, Cush.: Xamta ṣawḵ “to ask”, Ometo ṣayk, Kaffa ṣook “to shout”, Som. ḍawaak “shout caused by grief” (HSED, n. 417), Egyp. ḍ‘ḵ “to cry out” (EHD II, 896): PHS compound-word: [ḍaW] “tumult, uproar, noise” as in CA ḍaḍā’ (by redupl.) id. and stem [‘aḵ or ‘uḵ] above.

c) Another related root is [‘aḵ] as in CA ‘aḵ‘aḵ or ḵu‘ḵu‘u “magpie”.

d) CA ra‘aḵ [r. r‘ḵ] “a kind of noise” (Al ‘Ayn I, 157) seems to be based on [‘ḵ], with [r-] being a proot, just like [w-] of [w‘ḵ] or of [‘wḵ] *sound or noise produced by anything or by an animal as it moves. However, it often expresses ‘sound’ made in the stomach, etc. and is similar to that expressed by* ḥaḵīḵ perh. “fart”, a word almost

impossible for a human being to pronounce without feeling pain in his throat

e) An etymologically different trilateral exists in CA as in zu'āku [z'k] "bitter water" (Al 'Ayn I, 133), which is a self-explained compound consisting of \*su- "water" (§2.8.12 above) and \*k "bitter (water)". The same word, i.e. zu'āku, was *once* heard as du'āku "bitter water". Farāhidi does not tell whether this form is the original one or dialectal. On the other hand, Bin Durayd in Jamharah assumes that ḍa'aḳa = za'aḳa in meaning: comp. ḍā'a "spread news, broadcast".

**3.11.62** Akk. nabū "to call, to announce", JAram. nb' *Ithpa.*, Mand. nb' "to prophesy; prophet" (MD, 287), EHeb. nb' /nābī'/ "prophet" (NWSI II, 711), BHeb. nb': *Niph.* and *Hithpa.* "to speak under a divine influence; to chant, sing sacred songs, to prophesy", BAram. nb' *Ithpa.* "to prophesy" (OT, 638-639), CA naba'a, CII nabba'a, CIV 'anba'a "to announce, inform, to tell"; CV tanabba'a "to prophesy, to foretell, to speak under a divine influence"; nabī'u (~ nabīyyu) "prophet", Sab. nb' "to exclaim", Soq. nb' "to nominate", Ge. nbb "to speak", OAram. nb', Nebo, "deity" (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 5), Egyp. nb "lord, master" also Nb, a god (EG, 573; HED I, 357f); Chad.: Tangale nabi "to read" (HSED, n. 1822).

a) A closely related trilateral is [nby ~ nbw] as in CA nabiyy "elevation, landmark used as guidance, mountain"; nubuwwu "prominence, eminence, highness"; nabwu "elevated" (MA, 385; LA), BHeb. Nebō "the planet Mercury", which was worshipped by the Chaldeans and Assyrians, Bab. Nabū, Mand. nbu id. (MD, 287)).

b) Trilaterals cited above, in addition to many others with [nb-] as 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> radicals respectively, are based on \*bW- as in CA ba'wu "greatness, grandness, magnificence" = Egyp. bw "be great, be marvelous, to magnify": see §2.1.6.8.5, n. vii, under *Comments* above. This meaning is expressed by nearly all roots beginning with \*nb- as in CA nabiha or nabaha "famous", nabaya "to excel, be distinguished by superiority"; nābiyah "illustrious or eminent person", nabaḳu "elevated ground or land", etc. : see [baW-] in §3.1.6.5.5, n. 3f under *Comments* above.

**2.11.63** CA nādā "to call (out), to boast", Sab. ndy "to proclaim" (SD, 91), Assy. nadū "to praise, exalt" and "to raise a cry, recite a spell or incantation" (King, 1898:366), Akk. nādu, na'adu "to praise, boast", Eth. n'd, SA n'd id., Chad.: Diri nda "to speak, say", Miya and-, Mburku und- id. (HSED, n. 1893). The addition of suffixed -h gives rise in CA to nadaha "to call (out)", of -b to nadaba "to lament (loudly a dead person)", of -s nadsu "hidden voice".

#### *Comments*

We have thus far examined closely many trilaterals beginning with \*na- and having to do with "sound, noise". In addition to those we have studied above (§§2.11.49, 2.11.53-2.11.62 above). The question rises here, *is \*na- a proot, which also signifies "sound, noise", a reflexive element, or from [na']* in §2.11, n. 6 above?

In assuming that \*na- is a proot, we find that it manifests itself as \*'an- in some roots and \*na'- ~ nah- in some others. For trilaterals beginning with [n-], see §2.11.89, under *Comment*, n. a-d below. The following are some trilaterals beginning with [n'-] and its

variant [nh-]:

a) BHeb. nā'am "to murmur, to mutter, to speak in a low voice", CA na'ama id. (OT, 637) also, said of a man, "to moan, groan", said of a lion, "to growl", Egyp. nym "the lowing of cattle" (EHD I, 345): see BHeb. [nhm] in n. (d) below.

b) BHeb. nā'aḳ "to groan, to cry out from pain and anguish" (OT, 638) = 'ānaḳ id.

c) CA na'ata "to moan, groan" ~ nahata = 'anna in meaning, but 'moaning' expressed by na'ata is louder than that expressed by 'anna (ŠHH I, 268). The two radicals /-'/ and /-h-/ are variants of the same form.

d) Other trilaterals beginning with [nh-] are BHeb. nāhī "elegy, song of wailing"; nāhā "to wail, lament, to cry", in Syr., Eth. id (OT, 653), BHeb. nāhama "to growl, snarl" (OT, 654).

Returning to the question just raised above, the real problem here does not lie in the position occupied by \*- whether it is before or after \*na-, but it lies in the grave consequence of the assumption that \*-n- is a proot signifying "sound, noise", which simply implies that HS employed compound words consisting of two elements, of which the 2<sup>nd</sup> element is synonymous to the 1<sup>st</sup>, used perhaps to strengthen its meaning or make it more explicit. This assumption brings us very closely to CA **Itbā'** (see §2.17 below). Although there is no denying that HS had such compounds at one or more stages of its development, yet I have no evidence to suggest that [na-] is part of such compounds. Accordingly, [na] could be in many trilaterals discussed so far identical with that discovered in §2.11, n. 6 above.

**2.11.64** CA nadḏa "to pass or flow slowly and little by little (of water), to ooze out by drops (of water)"; nadīdu "little water"<sup>154</sup> = Egyp. nd'-t "the deposit left by the inundation of the Nile", apparently related to nd "little, something small" (EHD I, 411).

1) The biradical [nd] serves as a base for a number of kindred trilaterals as BHeb. nāṣaḥ "to sprinkle, to scatter, e.g. *water*", Eth. nzḥ id. (OT, 689), CA naḏaḥa "to sprinkle with water". Another trilateral expressing the same meaning is [ndḥ].

In their attempt to differentiate between [ndḥ] and [ndḥ] in meaning, some old Arab scholars held that if the amount of scattered or sprinkled water is little, [ndḥ] is used. For some others, [ndḥ] is used only if the amount of water is very copious (MA, 394; LA) as in the Koran: *فيه عينان نضاختان*, *In them both are two springs gushing forth* (55: 66). It is also said: «*yaiṯu* (= rain) *naddāhu* (= copious)», SL, naḏaḥ "to leak very little amount of water" also "to sweat" (CA naḏaḥa "to sweat"), whereas \*naḏaḥ is not in use (ḏaḥḥ is in use: see below). In Sab. we find both trilaterals: ndḥ "water distributor" and ndḥ "sprinkle with impurity" (SD, 92), a meaning also expressed by CA [ndḥ].

2) The deepest proot here is [ḏ-] "water". I do not know the signification of \*n- in [nd], perh. "by itself" as in [ndḥ] and [ndḥ]. Of the last two trilaterals, the proot to which /h ~ ḥ/ was suffixed is certainly [ḏḥ] as in CA ḏaḥḥa "to pump, to squirt"; midahḥa-tu inst. To Abu Maṣṣūr (see LA), nouns *ḏaḥḥu* ~ *nadḥu* ~ *nadḥu* express the same meaning.

<sup>154</sup> It may be related to [nwd] whose basic lexical meaning centers round "to move" as in *nawḏu* "movement". A traditional derivative of this root is 'anwāḏu, pl., "oulets of water", where the 2<sup>nd</sup> element [-ḏ-] = liquid.

3) The corresponding cognates in Semitic languages *are certainly impossible to pinpoint without knowing the original concept to which [ḏh] applies*. The concept is, as one should expect after *thinking deeply of a primitive meaning for [ḏh] long before the invention of ‘pump’*, “to excrete urine, urinate”, hence BHeb., BAram., Syr. ṣḥn “to be filthy, foul”, BHeb. ṣaḥanā(h) “stench” (OT, 890), JAram. ṣḥn, Mand. ṣahna “stinking, foul, filthy, defiling”, Akk. ṣēnu “bad”, orig. “stinking” (MD, 385). The corresponding form in CA is [snh ~ ṣnh] id., which infixed rather than suffixed /n/, and with /s ~ ṣ/ rather than /ḏ/. One can add an additional trilateral with /z/ as a result of the interchange of /ṣ ~ s/ as in BHeb. znh “be foul, rancid, to stink” (OT, 248), CA [znh] id.

4) A trilateral based on stem [ḏah] and representing an interesting semantic change is seen in mu-wāḏaha-tu [wḏh] “contest or competition in running”. Farāhīdi (Al ‘Ayn IV, 283) states that *the root meaning lies in “a contest in drawing water from a well”, later this basic meaning was metaph. extended to ‘contest in running’*.

5) A semantically similar trilateral to [nḏ] is [bḏ] as in Akk. baṣāṣu “to drip, fall drop by drop, flow”, BHeb. bōṣ “mire, mud, in which one sticks fast”; biṣṣā “a marsh, fen”, NHeb. bāṣaṣ “to ooze”, Aram. biṣṣā, būṣa “mud (of pond), pond”, CA baḏḏa “to fall drop by drop, ooze out by drops, to flow slowly little by little (of water)”; baḏūdu, said of a well and of any container for water, “flowing little by little, of little water” = baṣbāṣu id. (DRS II, 78; OT, 149; LA). For proot [ba-], see § 2.13 below.

**2.11.65** BHeb. nāzā “to leap for joy, to exult, to spring”, said of liquid “to leap forth, to spout, to be sprinkled”; *Hiph.* “cause to leap, make rejoice” also “to sprinkle, e.g. *water, blood*” = CA nazā, said of a male animal when it wants to copulate with its female “to leap (here and there round a female), jump over its back for sex”; nuzā’u “copulation”. The verb also expresses “to ooze out”, said of blood, “to bleed” = nazza “to ooze out by drops” like nadḏa in §2.11.64 above.

The data set forth above show that there is a relation between “joy, rejoice”, “leap”, and “ooze or sprinkle”, and that the three terms describe three consecutive processes of ‘*sexual intercourse between animals*’ from beginning to end: first, *a male animal leaps here and there round its female, approaching it, and jumping over its back* (> to leap, spring); second, *the male ejaculates semen* (> to ooze, sprinkle); and third, *the final process is crowned with ‘the joy of sex’*. All other related trilaterals revolve around the ideas just mentioned: cf. CA nazza [r. nz] “to ooze” also, said of a male ostrich “to run and roar, esp. *in excitement*”; nazza-tu “lust”, nazru “little of anything”; nazūru, said of a she-camel, “one copulating by force”, nazību “noises uttered by a male when copulating with its female”, nazafa “to bleed”; nazīfu “bleeding”, nazku “penis of some animals”, hence also “small spear”.

**2.11.66** Assy. naṣū “to raise, bear up”; niṣu “people; mankind” (King, 1898: 371), OAkk. nṣ’ “to bear” (Gelb, 1961: 179), Ug. nṣ’ “to raise, lift up” (UG, 531, 535), Phoen., OAram., OffAram. nṣ’ “to lift up, to carry” (NWSI II, 760-762), BHeb. nāṣā “to lift up, raise, take up; bear up” (OT, 695f) also “accept”, CA naṣa’a “to grow, to arise, come into being, bring up”; CIV ’anša’a “to construct, build, create”; Sab. ns<sup>2</sup> “to build up, raise”; ns<sup>2</sup>-n “social class”; mns<sup>2</sup> “tribal assembly” (SD, 98-99). It should be note

that Sab. ns<sup>22</sup>-n terminate with nunation, exactly like its CA cognate naš'u-n “progeny, (new) generation; arising”<sup>155</sup>. The trilateral seems to be based on \*ša'- “to raise” as in Egyp. šwy id., Chad.: Wrj, Cagu, Geji, Ngz, Zem ša “stand up”, Kry, Diri, Miya, Mbu ša- id., Tera ža “stand up, rise”, Boka že'i, Mrg šay, Hb ša-wo id., Smr so, Lele sē id. (HSED, n. 516).

The earlier proot has also been preserved in some Semitic languages as in BHeb. šī' “elevation, eminency”, mistakenly assumed to be a reduced form of nəšī', CA ša'ā “to precede, be in front, rank first” as a n. ša'wan. For BHeb. notion of ‘accept’ above: cf. CA šā'a “be willing, have the power of using one's will in any matter”; ma-šī'a-tu “volition; will” = Egyp. š' “to decide, determine, destine, decree, ordain” (see §2.8.42 above). The [n-] is the same as that of [ngb] “give birth to a baby”, [nsl] (§2.11.25 above), etc.

**2.11.67** Egyp. nšny “sharp”, Akk. nasinu “sharp point, nail” (HSED, n. 1824) = CA ma-snūnu “sharp”: sanna “to sharpen, wet”; sinnu “point, tip”; sinānu “spear-head”; sinnu “tooth”, gen Sem. šin id.

**2.11.68** na'afa “to eat to excess” (Al 'Ayn VIII, 377), la'afa lit. “to eat food very well” (LA): PHS stem [ʾap- ~ ʾaf-] as in Egyp. ʾf “glutton, greedy man” (EHD I, 5).

**2.11.69** CA naθa'a “to spew, vomit”; CIV ʾanθa'a “to bleed from the nose” < θa'a “to vomit, spew”; CVII ʾinθa'a “to bleed from the nose or from a wound”.

**2.11.70** Eth.: Ge. nākha “to wake up”, Har. nākāḥa, Tna. nākḥe, Arg. nākḥāha, Amh., M., Ms. nākḥa(m), S. nākā, W., Z. nākā id. (HED, 119), CA naḥiha “to understand” also “be convalescent”; naḥihu “understanding or thinking with speed and dexterity, i.e. quick” (Al 'Ayn III, 369; ṢḤḤ VI, 2253). All are from a stem seen in CA CIV ʾa-yḥaha, “to understand”.

a) A closely related trilateral is [pḫh] as in CA faḥiha “to comprehend, grasp, to understand”; fiḥhu “understanding, knowledge; jurisprudence”; CIV ʾafḥaha “to show, point out” (Al 'Ayn III, 370; ṢḤḤ VI, 2243).

**2.11.71** BHeb. ngr “to flow out, be poured out”, BAram. ngr “to flow” (OT, 648), Sab. ngr “water-wheel” (SD, 93): stem \*gar- (see §2.2.57.7 above).

**2.11.72** CA nufūru “fleeing, flight”, nafara “to flee and go away, startle away” < CA farra, Ug. pr “to flee” (§2.2.16 above).

**2.11.73** BHeb. nāṭā(h) “to stretch out, extend” (OT, 666), CA naṭā “to stretch out”; naṭwu “farness”; naṭiy “far, distant”, etc.: \*ṭa-(W)- “long/tall” (§§2.10.33 above and 2.14.1 below).

<sup>155</sup> For another example of *nunation*, see §3.1.57 below.



**2.11.74** CA *nafa* “to jump” < *fazza* id. Some other trilaterals are also formed from PHS stem \**paz-* as those in §§2.3.19 above, 2.12.22 below.

**2.11.75** OSA *nt* “to humble; destruction” is, according to Stehle (JAOS, 60, 516), from *nd* id. < *wd* as in OSA *wd* “to humble, destroy”, CA *waḏa’a* “to humble; put down” also “to set, place, fix properly” < \**ḏa-* (see §2.12.13 below).

**2.11.76** CA *naḡḡaša* “to embitter one’s life”, Ug. *nyš* “to tremble” (UG, 536): CA *ḡašša* “to choke”; *ḡašša-tu* “distress, grief”. This is the same stem seen in §§2.1.6.11 & 2.11.38 above. It is also seen with prefixed [m-] as in *mayš* ~ *ma’š* “gripes, colic”.

**2.11.77** Akk. *nagaru* “carpenter” (AG, 90), CA *naḡḡāru* id.; *naḡara* “to work in wood”, Phoen. ngr “carpenter” (PG. 123), Ug. ngr id. (UG, 531), Hatra, Palm., Nab., Pun. ngr id. (NWSI, II, 715), etc. are from a stem \**gar-* “tree, wood” as in Egyp. gr “a kind of tree”, Chad. \**g-r* “bush” (RPAA, n. 283), CA *ḡarru* “foot of a mountain”; *ḡarḡar* “a kind of plant”, etc. (see §2.15.21 below)<sup>156</sup>.

**2.11.78** CA *nataba* *obso.*, seen only in Poet. “to rise, move upward, be elevated (usu. by *itself* or *oneself*)” is from a stem \**tab* as in Akk. *tebū* “to rise”, Egyp. *tbṭb* “pull up, raise” (EHD II, 827).

**2.17.79** Akk. *naḥlu*, *naḥallu*, ESA *nḥl* “valley”, Mand. *nahla* “valley, brook, ravine, torrent” (MD, 281), Sab. *nḥl* “palmgrove” (SD, 94), BHeb. *naḥal* “a stream, brook, torrent” also “a valley, ravine, watered by brook or torrent” (OT, 663), Egyp. *nḥr* “brook, stream, river”, Bab. *naḥlu* (EHD I, 387), CA *naḥlu* coll. (masc. in *Hiḡāz* dialect & the Koran and fem. in *Naḡd*) “palm trees”, sg. *naḥla-tu*. The notions “water” and “valley” have been preserved in place-names: *naḥlu* (sg.) and *naḥlatain* (dual) respectively. The root is based on [hl] “ravine, valley” as in CA *ḥalla-tu* fem. id., etc. see §2.1.14.1, n. 3k, under *Comments* I above.

**2.11.80** CA *naha’a* [nh’], a root so difficult to pronounce, “make oneself vomit”; *nuḥū’u* = *hā’ā* [hw’] “to vomit”; *ta-hauwu’u* “making oneself vomit” (Al ‘Ayn I, 108): *ha’a* [h’] “to vomit” (LA): comp. with the root in §2.11.69 above.

**2.11.81** CA *naḡaza* “to prick, sting (with a needle, etc.)”. SL has both *naḡaz* and *ḡazz* “to prick, sting (with a needle, etc.)”, with the former being evidently derived from the latter. In CA and SL *waḡaza* expresses “to prick, sting (with a needle, spear, etc.)” and so do *naḡaza* and *naḡasa*, Chad.: Mafa *ngəz* “throw (a spear)”. You can, if you like, infix /-r-/ as in *ḡaraza* to express a similar meaning. The verb *ḡaraza* is not common, and has survived in a number of derivatives; one of which is *miḡrazu* inst. “awl”. See §2.13.13 below for more trilaterals based on stem [ḡaz].

<sup>156</sup> Another trilateral based on [gar] is seen in Assy. *šigaru* “bolt of a door”, CA *šaḡar* pl. “tree”, perh. BHeb. *səḡōr* = CA *šiḡāru* “a wooden spear” (OT, 712), etc. To [gar] may ultimately belong Sab. ngr “cultivated land” (SD, 93), *hgr* ~ *’kr* (see §2.3.30 above), etc.

**2.11.82** Ug. nsk “to cast (metal); smith” also “to pour” (UG, 535, 531, 536), OAram. nsk “to pour out, hand out” (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 5), Phoen., nsk “to pour out, found (in metal), forge”, OffAram. nsk “libation”, Pun. nsk “molten, cast metal” (NWSI, II, 735f), also in Pun. ysk “be poured out (said of lead)” (NWSI I, 462), BAram. nsk “to pour out, make libation; libations, drink offerings”, BHeb. nesek “a libation, drink-offering” also “a molten image” (OT, 677), also BHeb. ysk “to pour”, intrans. “be poured” (OT, 406), OSA ns<sup>3</sup>k “rations” (Stehle, JAOS 60, 1940: 528), CA nasaka “to wash and purify”; nusku “shedding blood”; nusuku “sacrifice” and also “blood”, hence *nusuku* or *manāsiku* pl. “rite, ritual”; nasīku “gold, silver”; nasīka-tu, like sabīka-tu, “pure ingot of gold or silver”.

Also belong here Akk. nisakku “priest”; nasīku “chieftain, prince”, OAram. nsyk “leader”, OffAram. nsyk “prince” (NWSI, II, 735; MD, 284), CA nāsiku “a hermit, ascetic”. All are probably from a stem \*sak. One should keep in mind, however, that the notion of ‘cast metal, found’ as expressed by Semitic [nsk] is of course a later development in history. The discovery of ‘metal’ necessitates the creation of a term for expressing “to cast”, and the meaning ‘pour water’ has been extended to “cast metal, found metal”. By eliminating this semantic feature from the underlying meaning of \*sak, we come very close to CA [θġ] as in θaġġa “to pour out” also “to shed blood”. A third fact should be taking into account is that one should also be aware that BHeb. ntk “to pour, to overflow”; *Niph.* “be poured out” (OT, 702) is ultimately from [θaġ] and not from [sak]. Note that PSem. \*θ is /š/ in Heb., but in some roots it is \*t as in BHeb. tāḳap “to overpower, to press wholly, to prevail against” = CA θḳf id. (Koran 8: 57): see OT, 1116, etc. It is possible that Heb. ṭḳp, together with few other words with /t/ instead of /š/, is a loan from Aramaic dialects.

**2.11.83** BHeb. nāṭā “to incline downward, bow” as in Gen. 24, 14, etc. (OT, 666-667), seemingly a reflex. caus. of waṭā, waṭṭā “to bow down”: comp. SL nawṭā (clearly CVII of [wṭ]) lit. “make oneself bow down, incline downward”; waṭṭā “make incline downward, lower, cause to bring from a high to low position, bow down”; waṭā “low (land, ground)” = CA waṭiya “to lower”; wāṭī, wāṭi’ “low”, Meh. wōṭī “low, level, flat”, Hars. wāṭa’ “low (land, ground)”; awēṭa “to descend”, Jip. ōṭi “to bring from a high to a low (position)” (DRS VI, 526).

a) It appears that CA triliteral [wṭW] is from a stem \*ṭa’- as in CA ṭa’ṭa’ “to lower, bring to a lower position”, orig. “to earth, ground” later extending to any place. By adding a prefix w-, we get the traditional triliteral [wṭ’] as in waṭi’a “to set a foot on, trample or tread under foot”; CII waṭṭā “to lower, press down, bring to a lower position”, etc. For proot [ṭa’] “earth, ground”, see §2.17.29 below.

b) CA raṭa’, waṭi’a, šaṭa’, maṭa’, etc. “have sexual intercourse with a woman”, orig. on earth > on woman.

**2.11.84** CA natala “to draw or pull forward” (MA, 385) is evidently from talla id.

**2.11.85** CA na’ala, said of a horse, “to shake while moving” < ’alla, said of a horse, “to

shake while running”.

**2.11.86** Assy. naraṭu “to begin to quiver (of the feet), become heavy”: PHS stem [naṭ-] as in SL naṭṭ “to hop” = Ug. nṭṭ “to tremble” (UG, 536). Aram. rṭṭ “to tremble” (Hurwitz, 1966: 102), SL raṭṭ “to shake while walking or moving” are variants of [naṭ-].

**2.11.87** CA na’āṭa, said of camels, “to sigh as expressive of heavy load” < ’aṭṭa, said of camels, “to voice a deep sound expressive of heavy burden” (Al ‘Ayn VII, 470; LA), BHeb. ’aṭ “a gentle sound, murmur, whisper” (OT, 38).

**2.11.88** Assy. nadū “to set or place (a dwelling), to found (a shrine)” (King 1989: 366), CA nādī, nadiyyu “club, assembly”, i.e. *where people get together*, as in the Koran: (وَتَأْتُونَ فِي نَادِيكُمُ الْمُنْكَرَ) , *And you commit evil deeds in your assemblies* (29:29); CVII ’intadā, said of people, “to gather together, be gathered in one place”; nadā, caus., also “bring people together to sit and talk”; nadwa-tu “a group of people getting together”.

The Egyp. cognate seems to be *nd* “to bind, tie” (409), a compound of *nw* “to bind together, tie” (EHD I, 351) and [-d].

a) Trilateral [ndy ~ ndd] expresses a meaning opposite to that expressed by CA ndy/-w above as in CA nadā “to withdraw from, keep away from”, Akk. nadū “to throw out”, in Assy. “to throw, cast, cast down” (ibid.), Sab. ndy “to drive out” (MD, 289), Ug. ndy “to drive out” (UG, 532), Moab. ndy “to exclude, separate” (NWSI II, 717), BHeb. nādā “to flee, recede, drive away” (OT, 651), JAram. nd’, ndy “to excommunicate, throw”, Ge. nād’a “to push”, Har. tā-nāda’a “resign oneself”, Amh. nadda, etc. (HED, 117). The same sort of meaning is expressed by [ndd] as in BHeb. nādād, intrans, “to flee (away), CA nadda id. The Koranic: (يَوْمَ التَّنَادِي) may be interpreted as “*The Day of fleeing in every direction*” or “*The Day of calling out (one another)*” (LA, r. ndd also ndy), NWS ndd “to flee”, Akk. nadādu “to make way, to yield” (NWSI II, 716), BAram. ndd ~ nwd “to flee” (Rosenthal, 1963: 90), Egyp. nwd “to move out of place, to slip, to yield ground” and nd’ “to escape” (EHD I, 356, 409), Chad.: Bolewa ndi-, Karekare nde-, Polchi nduwu “to go away” (HSED, n. 1826).

It seems that words in (a) above are based on a stem \*’ad or \*da’ as in CA ’adā “to move neither fast nor slow” = Egyp. ’dw “make one’s escape, flee, run” (EHD I, 14). Other variants of the same root are CA d’w, d’y “to sneak (a wolf) ~ ’dy/’dw id., Egyp. wd “to dismiss”, etc. In addition, CA reduplicated da’da’a “to run most rapidly” = Egyp. d’ “to flee, to escape”, Ug. d’y “to fly”; diy “a bird of pray” (UG, 532, 530), BHeb. d’y “to fly”; dā’ā “a species of ravenous bird having a rapid flight” (OT, 208), Berb.: Izy eddu, Kab. ddu “to move, walk”, Chad.: Angas dā “to do”, Miya ḏiy “to come”, Logone. da, di “to lead”, Housa dawo “return” (HSED, n. 593, 597). See §2.4.31 above.

**2.11.89** CA [r. nsḵ]: nasaḵu “order, system”; nasaḵa, CII nassaḵa “to put in proper order, to fix in a systematic way, to arrange systematically, coordinate”, Eth. nsḵ “in good order” = CA [r. wsḵ]: CVIII ’ittisāḵu (< \*’iwtisāḵu) “order, regularity” from CVIII \*’iwtasaḵa > ’ittasaḵa.

1) The basic meaning of [nsḵ] “setting in order one thing next to another” and that of

[wsk] “joining one thing to another, uniting things, or gathering together (+ in a systematic way)” as a vb wasaḡa as in the Koran: (والليل وما وسق); CX ’istawsaḡa-, said of camels, “be gathered together one next to another” (Al ’Ayn V, 191).

2) CA-Eth. [nsk] has been wrongly identified with Akk. našāḡu, Heb.<sup>157</sup>, Aram., Syr., Mand. nšḡ “to kiss”, orig. ‘to touch, be in contact’ (MD, 307). The root is also seen in Ug. nšḡ “to kiss” (UG, 533), etc. This trilateral and its kindreds below are troublesome to deal with just like any Semitic trilateral including radical /š/, which is not orig. from HS \*š. The real CA cognate is našaḡa “take or draw into the nose or mouth”, hence to *breathe in, sniff, inhale as in smelling something, to smell*. CA [nšḡ] and its cognates are closely related to a number of triliterals having to do with ‘breathing’ as the following examples show:

2a) Aram., Syr., Mand. nšm “to breathe, blow” (MD, 307), BHeb. nāšam “to breathe”; nišəmat “breath, life” (= nepeš); nəšāmāh “living thing, animal” (= nepeš id.), BAram. nišəmə “breath, life” (OT, 700). The CA cognate is with /-s-/: [nsm] as in ta-nassama = ta-naḡḡasa “to breathe”, nasmu “breath”; nasamu, “breeze” also in Poet. “nose”; nasma-tu, in *Hadith*, = nafs “soul, spirit, life”. See [npš] in §2.11.90 below.

2b) Akk. našāpu, BHeb. nāšap “to blow, breathe”, BAram. nišpā “breath, life” (OT, 700-701), Sab. ns<sup>3</sup>f “to scatter (dust), to destroy” (SD, 99), CA nasafa “to sweep away the dust, scatter the dust; be swept away by the wind (dust)” also “to demolish, destroy (a house), i.e. *reduce it to dust*” as in the Koran: (وإذا الجبال نسفت), *And when the mountains will be reduced to dust* (77: 10). The meaning may extend to “ashes” as in the Koran: (لنحرقه ثم لنسفه في اليم), *Certainly will we burn it, and certainly will we scatter its ashes in the sea* (20: 97), nasafa also denotes, like saffa, “to sift; winnow”; minsafu “a kind of sieve”. This CA trilateral is undoubtedly based on stem [saf] (see §2.2.30 above).

2c) BHeb. nāšab “to breathe; to blow, of the wind”, BAram., Syr. nšb id. (OT, 699). In CA CIV ’anšaba, said of strong wind, “to blow the dust”.

<sup>157</sup> BHeb. nāšaḡ also expresses “to bend a bow”; nēšeḡ, nešeḡ “a weapon” coll. “weapons”. Kindreds are, according to Gesenius (OT, 701), [yḡš], [nḡš], [ḡwš] “to set a springe”, whence ḡešet “bow”. Gesenius believes, however, that the two notions expressed by [nšḡ] are unrelated, and that “to kiss” is onomatopoeic. His view is as follows:

«The signif. commonly assigned to 𐤒𐤍𐤕 II, is that of *arming oneself*, and then this is connected with that of *kissing* by an assumed primitive notion of *fixing, adjusting*, comp. Ez. 3,13. But the context requires the meaning above given; and all the ancient versions and the etymology confirm it. The signif. of *kissing* is therefore plainly different from II; and is perhaps onomatopoeic, like the words for *kissing* in many other languages, as Germ. *küssen*, Engl. *to kiss*, Grk *ῥίω*, Pers. *پوس*, Germ. and Swed. *puss*, Engl. *buss*, comp. Lat. *basium*, Ital. *bacio*; Germ. *Schmatz*, Engl. *smack*.» (p. 701).

It may also belong here CA ’unšūḡa-tu fem. “noose, springe”. CA našaḡa, CIV ’anšaḡa “to hunt by a noose or by springe” as in Poet.:

«manāḡīnu ’abrāmin ka’anna ’akuffahum  
’akuffu ḡibābin ’u-nšīḡa-t fī (’a)l ḡabā’ili» (LA).

2d) CA našā “breeze” and as a vb “to smell” = šamma, the most commonly used verb for “to smell”.

2e) CA našaya “to breathe, as when one feels a sense of relief” also = našaḳa = naša‘a “to snuff”, SA: Meh. še-nšē‘, Jib. niša “to sniff”.

#### Comments

a) CA [wšk] above = Akk. asāḳu “fortifier, redresser”, Šaf. wšk “emmmener, unir”, CA wasaḳa “accumuler, entasser”, etc. (DRS VII, 571) are, to my understanding, very ancient variants of [wθḳ]. For Akk. “fortifier” = CA [wθḳ] in waθḳaḳa (‘ilāḳatahu ma’) = (he) fortified or strengthened (his relation with), from the notion “*bind*” (see §2.12.3 below).

**2.11.90** Akk. napāšu “to breathe”; napištu “life, living creature, person”, Ug. npš “soul”, Phoen., Pun. npš, OAram. nbš, OffAram., Palm., Hatra., JAram., Nab., Syr. npš “life, person, soul, funerary monument”, BHeb. nāpaš “to breathe”; nepeš “breath, soul, living thing, life”, Eth. nfs id., Sab. nfs “soul, person, self, life; funerary monument”, CA nafsu “soul, living creature, breath, breath of life, spirit, self ~ same, funerary monument”; CV tanaffasa “to breathe”; tanaffusu “respiration”; manfusu “infant, baby”; nafsā‘u, said only of a woman, “giving birth to a baby or being pregnant”, SL nafsā “about to give birth to a baby”. (MD, 304; NWSI II, 744f; UG, 536; OT, 684-685; SD, 93), Cush.: Saho nafse “breathing”, Chad.: Housa numfāšī “breath”, logone nawusə “soul”, etc. (HSED, n. 1830): PHS stem [nap-].

PHS [nap-] is seen in Egyp. nf “air, wind, breath”; nfw “breath”; nfi “to breathe” also “to blow at” (EHD I, 369-370); caus. s-nfi “to produce air, to fan” (EHD II, 606), nfy “to blow (out the nose)” (RPAA, n. 611). The exact Semitic cognate is seen in CA nafnafu “air between two things, e.g. *between sky and earth*”, SL naff “to blow out the nose”, nafnaf with reduplication, said of the rain, “shower” also “blow out the nose”, Cush.: Saho naf “breath, soul”, Som. naf, neef id., Oromo nafa “body”, Afar neef “face”, Chad.: Daba nip, Mus nap “breathe, smell” (HSED, n. 1828, 1865).

Some examples of additional trilaterals based on stem [nap-] are:

1) [npḥ ~ nph] as in BHeb. nāpaḥ “to puff, to blow, to breathe”, Syr. npḥ “to blow, breathe” (OT, 681), CA nafaḥa “to blow; puff”, nafaḥa “to expel air from the mouth, to inflate; to blow” also “to breathe into (as in the Koran 3: 48, 15: 29, 22, 9, etc.)”; minfāhu inst. “bellows, i.e. *producing air*”; CVIII ‘intafāha “be filled with air > to swell”, Eth.: Har. nāfaḥa “to inflate, blow an instrument, blow air into something”, Ge. nāfha “to blow, to breathe”, Tna. nāfḥe, Te. nāfḥa, Amh., E., M., Go. A. nāffa(m) id. (HED, 117).

2) The difference in meaning between CA nafaḥa above and nafaḥa is slight. As has been mentioned above, nafaḥa = “to expel air from the mouth”, while nafaḥa, said of a snake, “to bite, i.e. *to expel venom from its mouth*”, said of a wound, “to expel blood or bleed (understood as from the wounding place)”; naffāḥā-tu pl. occurs once in the Koran (113: 4): (النفاثات في العقد) and signifies “witch (fem.)”, i.e. *a female who practices magical arts by blowing on knots*; nafḥu “expelling air from the mouth which is often accompanied by some saliva in amount much less than that expressed by [tfl]” (LA). For

[tpl] and other HS trilaterals expressing “spit”, see §2.7.5 above. Nowadays, the use of nafaṯa is confined to smoke a sigarette, Ug. npṯ “to spit” (UG, 536), Chad.: Cagu pə “to spit”, Tera pəše id., Galambo pəs “to spit”, Kariya pəcə, Kirfi fīš-, Gera fiisii id., Diri pəṣa “to spit”, Berb.: Izayan fs “to spit”, Sunus s-ufəs id. (HSED, n. 1976).

3) [npt], whose -t forming a noun from a vb (see §2.9 above): Egyp. nft “to blow under oppression, suffer” (EHD I, 373) = CA nafata (~ nafaṯa) “to blow when angry; be angry; to boil”; nafatā-nu “(like) coughing and blowing when angry” (LA).

4) [npy]: Egyp. nf “to drive away” (EHD I, 370) = CA nafā “to dismiss or drive away, e.g. *one from his hometown or land; i.e. send or force into exile*” and both are from the notion “to expel (air)”: SL naf- can mean both “to blow, expel air from the nose” and “send into exile”.

5) In going back to Semitic [npš, [nph], etc. above and taking into account all Hamito-Semitic roots relevant to those under discussion, we find that PHS had a stem [nap-], signifying a very general meaning “breathing, blowing”.

#### Comments

At the end of this sketch of trilaterals beginning with [nap-], a number of important questions may be asked.

- i) *What is the ultimate origin of [nap-]?*
- ii) *Is there any linguistic relation linking the group of trilaterals just set forth above with another group beginning with [nš-] and expressing the same notion as in Sem. [nšp], [nšm], etc. “to breathe; breath” in §2.11.89 above?*
- iii) *Are trilaterals beginning with [np-] related to [’np] “nose” and its supposed kindred trilaterals given below?*

Trilaterals beginning with [’n-]:

- a) [’n]: in Ug. t’nt “murmur”, CA ’anna “to sigh, groan”; BHeb. hit’ōnēn “to groan”, Jp. ’anan, Syr. ’an id., Berb.: Iznasen, Senhaja ini “to say, tell”, Chad. Ngisim aṇ, Ndam, Dangla ane “to speak” (HSED, n. 40).
- b) [’nh]: in Akk. anāhu “to breathe with difficulty, sigh”, Ug. ’nh id., CA ’anaḥa “to breathe out, exhale”, esp. *when one is angry or jealous*, BHeb. ne-’enḥā “to sigh”, ’ānaḥ Syr. ’enaḥ “groan”, Man. tanihta “sigh”.
- c) [’nh] CA ’anaḥa “to breathe out heavily”, esp. *when carrying a heavy burden*.
- d) [’np]: in Akk. appu, Ug. ’p, BHeb. ’ap, CA ’anfu “nose”, Eth ’anf id., Har. af, Tna. ’anfi id., but in Egyp. ’np “child, boy” = CA ’anfu “master”.
- e) [’nš] “human being”: in BHeb. ’enōš “human being”, Palm., Hatra. ’nš “man, person”, Sab. ’ns “man, male”. This Semitic noun is originally coll.: CA ’insu, OAram. ’nš “mankind, creatures”. CA ’insānu “human being” is derived from /’ins/ by adding the suffix /-ānu/ = “one of unlimited number”. Like many CA nouns, ’insānu has another pl. form ’unāsu “human beings, people” (as in the Koran 2: 60, 7: 160), but is rarely used in literature. Another much more rarely used form is ’anāsiy (as in the Koran 25: 49), pl. of ’insiyān, dim. ’anaysiyān (Al ’Ayn VII, 304). The most commonly used form throughout the history of the language is nāsu, the reduced form of ’unāsu above. The initial syllable /’u-/ has been dropped for ease of pronunciation, as Farāhīdi rightly

stated (Al 'Ayn VII, 303; LA 'ns), Berb.: Ahaggar aynəs “man”, Cush.: 'is “self”, Nomoic is “one” (RPAA, n. 726).

f) ['nθ]: in Akk. aššatu “woman”, CA 'unθā “female, wife, woman”, Sab. 'nθ id., Ug. aθt “woman”, BHeb. 'iššah id., Pun. 'št, Nab. 'nth, Palm. 'tth, Syr. itta id., Ge. 'anəst “woman, female”, Chad.: Sha nisi “female”, Fyer nusi “woman”, Tera nušu id. Glavda, Gvogo nusa id., Cush.: Geleba anso “sister”: Kemant näsiyā “male”, Nao nuuše “husband”, Berb.: Ahaggar a-ynəs “young man”, etc. (HSED, n. 1887, 1788).

g) ['nm], like 'nš, has a pl. ending in -m: CA 'anāmu “mankind, people in general” also “creatures”, Sab. 'nm “populace in general”, Syr. 'nm’ “group of soldiers”, Eyp. 'nm “human beings”. Only in Poet. a variant 'anīmu can occur in CA according to Farāhīdi (Al 'ayn VIII, 288) = SL 'anīm (by *Imālah*). Unlike 'unāsu, nāsu above in (e), CA 'anāmu has no sg. form.

h) ['nr]: Ug. 'nr “dog”, Amh. 'anär “wild cat”.

i) CA 'āna-tu “a sheep”, Berb.: Gua ana id., Chad.: Siri yāni “she-goat”, Mig 'īnu “goat”, Jegu 'ēn pl. id., Bed ano “sheep” (HSED, n. 42).

Some other words having to do with animals: OSA 'nss(hm) “(their) animals”, Ge. 'ənsəsā “domestic animals”, Te. 'ənsus id., prob. from \*'nθ-s-, becoming by assimilation of /-θ-/ to /-s-/ \*'nss, expressing “female animals”.

#### Comments

The list of trilaterals just put forth above, like any other list of kindred trilaterals, reflects a long history of semantic and phonetic changes. Depending on their ultimate origins, the list can be divided in two groups: (a) *trilaterals expressing* “moan, speak, etc.” and (b) *trilaterals expressing* “human being”. For the former group, see *the last paragraph* in §2.11.63 above. The latter, i.e. ['nš], ['nθ], and ['nm], has evolved, as my intuition- though not my mind- tells, from a proot ['ay] “creature”. It is the same proot underlying such trilaterals as Ug. bnš “man”, CA ba'su “strength”, gen. Sem. 'yš “man”: gen. Sem. 'ayš- “be” (§2.17.5 below), CA ['yð] in 'āða “become”, 'ayšu (variant of 'yð or 'ays-) “be”, Akk. āru, ayyaru “young man”, etc.

**2.11.91** BHeb. nsk “to intertwine, weave, to hedge something with woven work” also “to cover, protect”, from the idea of *surrounding with a hedge*. Gesenius (OT, 677) identifies the BHeb. root with CA nasağa “to weave, intertwine, etc.”. Both are from [sk] as in BHeb. skk “to interweave, weave, to interlace” also “to cover; to hedge, to fence” (OT, 722) = CA [sk] as in CVIII 'istakka, said of plants, “be densely entwined, be intertwined to the extent that all openings through are closed off” also “be very narrowed, tight”, hence, said of the ear, “does not hear because it is so narrow”, i.e. ‘deaf’, as in the PIP of Nabīyah:

«'atānī'abīta ('a)l la'na'annaka lumtanī

wa tilka ('a)l latī ta-stakku minhā ('a)l masāmi'i».

Akk. sakku “deaf”; sukku “dam”; sakāku “to stop up”, JAram., Syr., CA skk “to stop, obstruct”, Mand. skk “to nail, fix in, stop, obstruct, enclose”, etc. (MD, 330) = CA sakaku “deafness”; 'asakku “deaf”; sakka “to nail, fix a door with sakkiy, i.e. *nail*, as in the PIP of A'sā:

«... kamā salaka (ʾa)s sakkiyyu fī (ʾa)l bābi faitaku» (LA).

Here may belong Ug. skk “a kind of garment” (UG, 533), Egyp. sk “to cover, to dress” (EHD II, 703), SA: Jib. sekk “to cover”, Chad.: Mofu sasəkw “to stop up” (HSED, n. 407).

Is there any relation between CA [nsġ] and [wšġ] “to interweave, interlace, and intertwine”? PIP Imri’ Al Qais says:

«ʾilā ʾirġi (ʾa)θ θarā wašaġ-at ʾurūḳī

wa hāḏā (ʾa)l mautu yaslubunī šabābī» (DI, p. 48, L. 5).

A more important question is: *isn’t there a close relation between [sak] and [skr], etc. in §2.2.56.4 above?* To my understanding, the relation is deeply rooted.

**2.11.92** CA našaḥa “to drink very little, i.e. *without quenching one’s thirst*” and *that drinking water* is called *nusūḥu* (MA, 391): šaḥḥ “scanty, very little”.

Additional examples showing a similar interchange of /š/ and /s/ are:

a) CA naša’a, said of clouds when they begin to appear (MA, 390) and nasi’a, said only of woman when her pregnancy begins (MA, 389).

b) Both šanna and sanna express in CA “to pour out (water)”. According to Jawhari (see LA r. snn), sanna = “pour out (gently) without scattering the water”, while šanna = “pour out and scatter the water”.

**2.11.93** Egyp. nḥ’it “naked things” (EHD I, 383), a compound of [n-] and [ḥ’] “naked” as in ḥ’-tw, ḥ’i “naked man”; ḥ’w “be naked, take off the clothes” (EHD I, 458). CA naḥḥit, said of hoof, “bare”. It appears that the CA word is a compound of at least three proots: [na-], [-ḥaw-], and [-t]<sup>158</sup>.

---

<sup>158</sup> Additional examples, esp. from Egyp. are:

a) Egyp. [šd] “to tie up in linen; cord” = CA šadda “to tie up tightly” > Egyp. nšdw “a girdle” (EHD II, 758; I, 395). Note that CA uses the inst. /mi-/ to express the same meaning: mi-šaddu “a belt, girdle”.

b) Egyp. [ḥrḥr] “to be glad, to rejoice” > [nḥrḥr] “to rejoice” (EHD I, 385, 499).

c) Egyp. [gsgs] “to overflow, increase, fill to overflowing” > [ngs] “to overflow, heaped up full of something” (EHD II, 800; I, 398).

d) Egyp. [gḥ] “be weak” = CA ġaḥġaḥu “faint-hearted, weak”: Egyp. [ngḥ] “be weak, inactive” (EHD II, 812; I, 398).

e) Egyp. [g’g’] “to cackle” > [ng’g’] id. (EHD II, 800; I, 398).

f) Egyp. [gb] “to fail, collapse, be helpless”; gbī “be weak, to collapse” = Sab. [gb’] “to retire, fall back, retreat, give in” (SD, 48), CA ġabba, ġaba’a “to fall back, retreat and seek refuge”, due to fear or weakness, in Poet. ġubba’i “coward, fearful” (Amali I, 277), CA ġabuna “be a coward, lose heart, be weak” > CA [nġb], preserved only in *mi-nġābu* “weak” (LA, r. nġb).

g) Egyp. [gbgb] “to overthrow, slay”, CA ġabba “to cut off, castrate”, in an old saying “to obliterate”, BHeb. [gbb], [gwb], [ygb] “to cut in, dig” (OT, 172) > Egyp. [ngb] “to be destroyed, to break”, CA naġaba “to peel, pare, sharpen”; naġba-tu, in an old saying, “a pinch, a sting” (LA).

h) Egyp. [šš] “to hasten, move rapidly” > [nšš] “to hurry, hasten” (EHD II, 754; I, 393) = Phoen. nss “to fly, flee” (NWSI II, 736), SL nass “to flee stealthily and rapidly”, CA nassa “to do anything rapidly, very swiftly”, said of a bird, “to hasten in flying” also “to drive animals fast, to



lead” ~ našša “to do (anything) very rapidly, hasten” as in Poet.

«yu-našnišu (’a) l-ġilda ’anhā wa hihā bārikatun...»

«fa našnaša ’iḥdā firsinaihā binašṭatin» (LA, r. nšš).

In CA we rarely find a root beginning with two identical radical consonants. Such two radicals are bound to be separated by a semivowel /w, y, or ’/, or preceded by a semivowel: comp. Egyp. “filth” (EHD I, 113) with SL (and most other Arabic dialects) “id. (pronounced /’a’/a/). Otherwise, the semivowel will be inserted in pronunciation, e.g. CA [ddm] > duwādimu “something like blood exuding from a kind of tree” (cf. CA dimā’ pl., Akk. damu “blood”), and [zzm] > zuwāzimu, said only of water, “between salty and fresh”. Triliterals, like [kḳḳ] “darkness, night”, are quite rare. On the matter of possible combinations in triliteral roots, Moscati (1969: §11.10) notices:

*«In no Semitic language can two identical consonants— or two consonants with a similar point of articulation— appear next to each other in first and second position; and it is rare for such consonants to be found as first and third radicals (e.g. Akk. hašāhu “to desire”)».*

Thus CA šawšā-’u fem. ~ wašwāšu, said of an ostrich, she-camel or woman, “be light-footed, swift” is orig. from \*šaš-. The root is found in other Semitic languages as in BHeb. šāšā(’) “to lead, make walk”, etc. (Ryder, 1974:105).

In addition, Egyp. nš denotes “to shake, dislodge, repulse” (Albright, JAOS, 27, 1927: 222) also “to frighten, drive away”; nšš “be agitated, shaken, disturbed” (EHD I, 393) is connected by Albright with CA lašša “to push, repulse”, lauwaša “to harass”, lašlaša “to shake with fear”. He also finds that *«the stem appears in Accadian (Assyrian), though hitherto unrecognized, in lāšišu “vagabond, robber”».*

The exact CA cognate is našša “to repulse, drive away”; našnaša “to shake, to push, to agitate”, SL našš, said of birds, “to drive them away from their locations by all means of frightening toward a trap (i.e. a tree with birdlime)”.

As for the Akk. word, it is cognate with CA liššu “thief, robber”, Phoen. lš id. (Bustani, 1985: 63-64): for the interchange of /š/ and /ṣ/, see §2.2.48 below.

i) Egyp. [hwi] “to protect” > [nhw] id. (EHD I, 537, 386) = CA nahwa-tu fem. “bravery, magnanimity”.

j) Egyp. [hmhm] “to roar, bellow”, hmhm-t “cry, roar, bellow” = CA hamhama and hamhama-tu respectively id., BHeb. hmh “to hum, growl, sound, make a noise” (OT, 257) → Egyp. nhmhm “to roar”; nhmnhm “to roar, rage” (EHD I, 447, 381) = CA nhm id., BHeb. nhm “to growl, snarl; to roar” (OT, 654).

k) Egyp. [hrhr] “to destroy, root up, be destroyed” > [nhrr] “be destroyed” (EHD I, 560, 388): PHS \*har- as in CA harra “to collapse, bring down (building), fall down to the ground, kneel down” as in the Koran: (وخر موسى صعباً), and *Moses fell down (to the ground) senseless* (7: 143) = Egyp. [hr] “to fall to the ground, fall down, overthrow, throw down”.

For Egyp. [nhrr] above, CA nahira “be decayed, be eaten away”; nahiru “sound, snuffing or snorting” = šahīru (see §2.11.23 below).

l) Egyp. g’ “to be in sore straits, to suffer want, to be empty of” > ng’ “to lack, want, be short of” (EHD I, 880, II, 397) = CA ġawā. A deep discussion of this proot will be presented in §2.12.40 below, esp. n. 3, under *Comments*.

m) Egyp. ys “to call to; to reckon a price; accountant” > nys “to call, cry out to; to reckon” (EHD I, 79, 345).

n) Egyp. fh “to unloose, undress, to detach, to strip”; caus. s-fh “to untie, loosen, unbind, to set free” ~ s-fhfh “to unloose, untie” ~ fhw “to undress” > nfhfh “to untie” (with m-: mfh “to untie, release, loosen”, with y- yfh “to untie, unloose, to disentangle”: cf. EHD I, 373, 296, 43; II, 665).

## 2.12 PHS PREFIXED /w-/:

### *Compounds With Initial Proot /wa'-/*

One of the functions of prefixed \*w- in many HS trilaterals is to convert feminine abstract nouns having the pattern [Fiḡa-tu] (-tu = a suffix forming feminine nouns, among others) into masculine (abstract) nouns and a type of causative verbs as in CA *sima-tu* “mark of distinction” > n. *wasmu* > vb *wasama* (see §2.12.4 below). The fact that gen. HS term *šumu* “name” (§2.3.19 above) is ultimately the same as *wasmu* raises the question whether /w-/ and /ʾ-/ are not originally variants of one single form. An examination of all roots with initial /w-/ and /ʾ-/ , though showing some interchanges of the two radicals in all positions, rules out the possibility.

1) Semitic languages, notably CA, have preserved sufficient evidence to prove the former existence of this ancient bound-morpheme. It may not be coincidental that in CA [Fiḡ] is also the stem of the imperative of many such derived verbs. Nor is it indeed a matter of chance that the plural of the stem \*Fiḡa-(tu) is the broken plural pattern Fiḡā-(tu). Some illustrative examples.

- [wʃl] (§3.12.1 below) *šila-tu* pl. *šilā-tu* imper. *šil!*  
[wʃf] (§3.12.2 below) *šifa-tu* pl. *šifā-tu* imper. *šif!*  
[wθk] (§3.12.3 below) *θika-tu* pl. *θikā-tu* imper. *θik!*  
[wʾd] (§3.12.10 below) *ʾida-tu* pl. *ʾidā-tu* imper. *ʾid!*  
[wsm] (§3.12.11 below) *sima-tu* pl. *simā-tu* imper. *sim!*

2) The method set forth above- which relies on *the imperative* and *plural forms*- for determining prefixed \*w- and distinguishing it from the root radical \*w- is not always safe and, as a result, possible errors may arise. In order to make it safer, and thus avoid as possible as one can erroneous analysis, the semantic test, as outlined in §2.1.12 above, will be used.

3) There is no denying that \*w- also has some other grammatical functions and meanings, and some of them are much older than the above mentioned functions.

There is some evidence that /w-/ is used, at least in CA, to form a noun from another noun as in CA *waḥṭu* “echo of footsteps” with no verbal form: *ḥuṭwa-tu* “a step”, pl. *ḥuṭā*; *ḥaṭā* “to step”; and *wayfu* “running fast” with no verbal form: SL *ṡaff* “to run fast”, developed from CA *ṡuffa-tu*: see §2.17.49 below.

4) It is most important to note that /w-/ is dropped in CI *imperfect* stems (present & future) without leaving any trace whatsoever as prefixed personal pronouns are added. Consider the following examples:

Perf. *waʃala* “arrive, connect”: imperf. *ya-ʃilu* (ya- = he), fut. *sa-ya-ʃilu*.

Perfect *waʃalnā*: imperf. *na-ʃilu*, fut. *sa-na-ʃilu*.

This phenomenon can be plausibly explained as that /w-/ was a grammatical element first prefixed to the perfect of a class of verbs but later spread from CI to all other common stems.

5) In Egypt., as in Sem., proot /w-/ is easy to recognize, but difficult to determine its exact meaning or function. Some examples are:

5a) Egypt. wmt “to copulate” < mt “man” also “mother, wife” (Sem. ’m “mother”, mt “man”: see §2.17.61 below).

5b) Egypt. whí “deprivation” as a vb “to fail”; wh-t “failure, ruin”; wh’n “to destroy”; whn “failure, decay, ruin” (EHD I, 176-177) < hy-t ~ hí-t “sickness” (EHD I, 443-444); hí ~ hw “fall down, descend” ~ h’ id. also “to go to waste and ruin, be destroyed” (EHD I, 439).

Egypt. wh and whn above = Sem. [wh] and [whn] respectively (see §2.11, n. 3h and ft above) and Egypt. hw above = Sem. [hw] (see §2.1.6.11, n. 5 above).

5c) Egypt. wbh “to shine, be bright” < bh “to give light, to light up” (EHD I, 160, 221): see §2.2.12 for cognates.

A careful examination of a large number of roots with initial /w-/ compels me to conclude that /w-/ was used at a particular stage to form substances.

6) Proot [w-] and a number of other proots can co-occur with the same stem to express *slight differences in the shade of meaning*, e.g. wzn ~ rzn (§2.5.9, under *Comments* above), waṣabu “sickness” ~ naṣabu “faintness due to extreme tiredness” (mu-ṣābu “misfortune, calamity”), rafada<sup>159</sup> “to scatter” also “to flow or shed (tears) in a scattered and continuous manner” = [wfd] as in CX ’istawfada “be scattered” = fadā “to scatter” also “break and scatter” = ta-raffada CV “to break”; rafaḍu “anything broken and scattered” = nafaḍa (see 2.11.2 above), etc. see §2.15 below. An additional example is wṣṣ ~ rṣṣ ~ bṣṣ ~ yṣṣ ~ ḡṣṣ (§2.16.13 above). Each initial proot orig. had a distinct signification.

7) Final [-w] has at least two major functions:

7a) to form a *masc. sg. noun (agent)* as in Egypt. ḥwrrw “beggar, poor man” from ḥwr “be poor, wretched, to beg” = CA ḥawaru “weak or feeble”: SL m-hawwir “exhausted (man), hungry (man)”, the deep meaning is ‘empty’ (§2.16 below),

7b) to indicate ‘*plurality*’ (see §2.9, under *Comments* above and §2.22.2, n. iv under *Comments* below).

**2.12.1** CA ṣila-tu “connection, relation, contact” also “assistance” *given to relatives as a sign of maintaining ṣilatu ‘ar-raḥami or ‘blood-relationship’*; Sab. ṣl-t “gift, assistance”, Min. ṣl-t id. > [wṣl]: Akk. eṣēlu “to bind, tie”, Ṣaf wṣl “to arrive” (DRS I, 30), CA waṣala “to connect, join, tie”; waṣala, said of a place, “to arrive at, get to, reach”, i.e. *be in direct touch or connection with the place = be at it*; CVIII ’ittaṣala (\*’iwtāṣala) “be connected with, be in touch with, i.e. *speak to*”, Sab. hwṣl, caus., “to arrive at a place, go to (a place)” also “to assemble, join together, rejoin”, Min. wṣl “to arrive at a place, to go to (a place)”, Qat. wṣl “offering”, Meh. wīṣal “to arrive, reach”, etc. (DRS VII, 593;

<sup>159</sup> CA rafdu arch. “food”, whose orig. stem is preserved in SL only in the fixed expression “ṭaiyir (= lit. *make fly*) l (= *the*) fadā (must be ‘food’). The expression signifies “to defecate”. A similar expression for “to urinate” is ṭaiyir ṣ (= l = *the*) šurb (= *drinking*, i.e. *water*). In simple words, the expressions = “void *food*” and “void *drink*” respectively.

SD, 164). In BHeb. the root is preserved in יָצַל “joint, juncture” (OT, 81), Phoen. yšl “joint” (PG, 107), Pun. yšlh id. (NWSI I, 465) = CA ’awšālu “joints” as in the PIP of Imri’ Al Qais:

«...walaw ḡaṭṭa’u ra’sī ladayki wa ’awšālī» (DI, p. 161, L. 4).

1) To make certain that our analysis of [wšl] is correct, we should examine the trilaterals [wšy] and [wšr ~ ’šr], which shares in common with [wšl] the first two radicals and semantically agree with it in the deep meaning ‘*connection, joining*’. For [wšr], see §3.3.32 above, bearing in mind that it expresses in CA “tie, bond, connection”, esp. *familial ties*, as in the PIP of Labīd:

«’abunā ’abūkum wa (’a)l ’awāširu bainanā ḡarībun...» (DL, p. 198, L. 4).

The word is from ’išru ~ wišru “covenant”, i.e. *one that ties, binds*.

As for other trilaterals beginning with [wš-], they have different origins: [wšd] “to close firmly (a door)”<sup>160</sup>, for [wšb], see §2.12.29 below; for [wšm], see §2.12.36 below, and for [wšp], see §2.12.2 below.

2) CA [wšy] expresses two related meanings:

2a) wašā denotes “to connect, join”, a signification seems to be identical with that of wašala above as far as ‘*speech*’ is concerned.

2b) waššā “to will, grant in a legal will” also “to commit to another’s charge or care; to ordain, to recommend”; wašiyya-tu “commandment, ordinance, will” as in the Koran: وصية من الله (this is an) *Ordinance from God* (4:12); ’awšā “to recommend, advise, endorse”, *of course through words, speech and not writing*. Cognates in other Semitic languages are Sab. wšt “to decree, ordain” (SD, 164-165), with final -t, a fem. suffix, becoming part of the root, Meh. awōši, Jip. ōši, ūši “faire ses dernière recommandations”, BHeb. šiwwā “fixer, ordonner”, etc. (DRS VII, 592), EHeb., JAram. m-šwh fem. “law, prescription” (NWSI II, 677). In addition, Egyp. wḏ “decree, law, will, command” as a vb “to decree, command” (EHD I, 191-192); ywḏw “to make an order or decree, to give a command” (EHD I, 37).

The data just set forth above show clearly that the Semitic surface trilateral \*wšl is a compound of two morphemes: \*waš- “connect, etc.” and \*-l-. This analysis of the root is certainly correct as long as we look at the data with one eye and interpret it accordingly. However, if we look at the data with both eyes and take into consideration all available facts concerning the trilateral, we will certainly find that the root can be plausibly divided into three morphemes \*/w-/, \*/-šy-/, and \*/-l-/.

3) To decide upon the ultimate origin of [wšl] is not an easy matter if we want to comply with the strictest demands of linguistic science, which requires that all facts concerning a word be ascertained before pronouncing any judgment on its origin. To determine with certainty the origin of [wšl], we will launch two arguments grounded on evidence and guided by reason.

3a) Semitic languages have a trilateral [nšl] and [’šl] expressing meanings opposite to those of [wšl]. For the former, see §2.21.1.2 below, and for the latter, see §2.21.3.2 below. Initial /\*n-/ and /’/ are negative elements added, exactly like /\*w-/, to a stem \*šal-.

<sup>160</sup> It is based on *šadda* “stave off, repulse”.

3b) Based on inferences drawn from the same data, however, one can also argue, that roots [nʃl & ʃl] are both from /n-/ , /ʃ-/ “not” + [-wʃ-] + -l-, and that the initial root radical /\*-w-/ has been lost in the course of time through some sort of phonological change. In yielding to reason, we have to admit that the argument is sound and strong and that the kind of sound change proposed can be supported by examples drawn from Semitic languages.

3c) Which of the three possible biliterals \*ʃal-, \*waʃ-, & \*ʃW- is the genuine free morpheme? Evidence tells that it is \*ʃW-. The underlying root \*ʃW- is seen in CA [nʃy]: cf. CA tu-nāʃī “be connected with” = tu-wāʃī [r. wʃy] “be connected with, be joined to” = ta-wāʃala “be in connection with”. This remarkable piece of evidence proves that \*n- and \*w- are both prefixed to an earlier biliteral \*ʃW-. The rational equation here is that if \*w- is part of the root, then \*n-, being on equal footing with it, is also part of the root, and that if \*n- is a prefix, then \*w- must also be a prefix.

3d) There is still one strong argument supporting an earlier proot \*ʃW-. As noted above, \*ʃW- deals with the notion of *speaking*. We will see in §2.21.3.4 below, for example, that the proot [ʃaw] expresses the same notion, and that both forms are ultimately from one single proot.

4) It is most likely that Assyr. aʃū “be decreed” (King, 1898: 323) and BHeb. yʃ’ “words, discourse, which go forth from the mouth” (OT, 413) belong to the triliteral under discussion (and not to \*wḏ’: cf. §2.10.25 above), and that all trilaterals cited thus far are orig. derived from the concept ‘*be connected with through words*’. It is interesting to note that this deep concept is also expressed by CA [wʃl] as in CVI tawāʃala, CVIII ʔittaʃala “to communicate with, speak to, be in touch with in words or speech, call”. For what concerns Assyr. and BHeb. trilaterals, what I claim is that two trilaterals \*wḏ’ “go out” and \*wʃy above, which had been possibly distinct in Proto-Semitic, later fell together into one single triliteral \*wʃ’, due to the regular change of PSem. /ḏ/ to /ʃ/ in both languages.

4a) In CA the interchange of /ḏ/ and /ʃ/ is quite common. However, in many cases in which the interchange occurs, the language preserved both forms, i.e. *one with /ḏ/ and another with /ʃ/*. A few of many examples of roots and words that can be cited are: nāʃa ~ nāḏa “to escape”; manāʃu “escape, escapable” (comp. Assyr. aʃū “allow to escape, let go”) ~ manāḏu id., yaʃʃa ~ yaḏḏa “to peep”, ʃaʔbalu ~ ḏaʔbalu “misfortune”, ḏwk ~ ʃwk “be stained, soiled”, ḏiʔḏiʔ ~ ʃiʔʃiʔ “progeny; issue”, ḏuwwa-tu ~ ʃuwwa-tu “cippus, sign-stone”, ḏabba ~ ʃabba “to pour, flow”, tafāwuʃu “negotiation”: fāʃa “to express oneself clearly in words” ~ fāwada “to negotiate”; tafāwuḏu “negotiation”, ʃaʔʃaʔa ~ ḏaʔḏaʔa “to scatter, to shake”, baḏḏa ~ baʃʃa “to ooze out by drops”, maḏḏa ~ maʃʃa “to suck” ~ mazza id. (maḏmaḏa ~ maʃmaʃa) = Akk. mazū, BHeb. māʃaʃ, māʃā, Aram. mʃʃ, JAram. mwʃ, Syr. meʃay id.), ʃbr ~ ḏbr (see §2.11.53, under *Comments* above), ʔuʃmūru ~ ʔuḏmūru “wheel”, ḡaʃʃaʃa ~ ḡaḏḏaḏa “to assault”, baʃʃaʔa ~ baḏḏaʔa “to sweat”; baʃʔu ~ baḏʔ “sweat”; ʔabʃaʔ ~ ʔabḏaʔ “entire, all”, ḡaʃaba ~ ḡaḏaba “to kindle a fire<sup>161</sup>; fire-

<sup>161</sup> The noun *ḡaʃabu* occurs in the Koran (21: 98) with the signification “fire-wood” and was consistently read by speakers of some old dialects as *ḡaṭabu*, by some others *ḡaʃabu*, and by others *ḡaḏabu*. The word may appear here as variant of *ḡaṭabu* “fire-wood”; *ḡaṭaba* “to cut wood” = BHeb. ḡaṭab id. (OT, 308), etc.

wood”, *dāfa* ~ *šāfa* “to deviate from, change direction”, [*ḡyḏ*] ~ [*ḡyṣ*] id., *maḥḏu* “pure, unmixed” as in *Arabiyyun maḥḏ* “a pure Arab” ~ *maḥṣu* “purifying”; *maḥaša* “to purify, free from any impurity, purge” (Koran III, 153), *qaḏbu* ~ *qaṣbu* “cutting”, *qaḏqaḏa* ~ *qaṣqaṣa* “to break”, *dāfa* ~ *šāfa* “to miss the target”, *ḏubādib* ~ *ṣubāṣib* “mighty”, *ḡunbuḏu* ~ *ḡunbuṣu* “short”, *šaḏfaḏ* ~ *šaḏfaṣ*, *ḏauḏu* ~ *ṣauḏu* “small bird”, and so forth. For additional examples, see §2.10.31 above.

It may be important to note that /ḏ/ and /ṣ/ do not co-occur in any Arabic word. The word *šaḏfaḏ* “300” was created as a compound of four elements used for calculating some types of sentences and consisting of four letters of the alphabet /ṣ(āḏ)/ “60”, /ʿ(ayn)/ “70”, /f(āʾ)/ “80”, and /ḏ(āḏ)/ “90” (Al ‘Ayn VII, 5).

4b) The interchange of /ḏ/ and /ṣ/ is also evident in OSA languages. On the interchange of emphatics /ḏ/, /ḏ/, and /ṣ/ in OSA, Stehle (JAOS 60, 1940: 519) finds:

*«Interchange of ḏ and ṣ indicates that it is possible for both signs to represent the same sound. There is even more abundant evidence for the identity of ḏ and ṣ in pronunciation, although interchange of ḏ and ṣ has in several cases been called to question...».*

The interchange of /ḏ/ and /ṣ/ is not uncommon in CA, though not as widespread as that of /ḏ/ and /ṣ/, of /b/ and /f/, of /θ/ and /f/, etc.: cf. *ʿadda* ~ *ʿadda* “to bite”, *ḥuḏadu* ~ *ḥuṣadu* “kind of medicine”, *muḥaḏrab* ~ *muḥaṣrab* “full”, etc. It is to be noted that /ḏ/ cannot occur initially in any trilateral when the second radical is a stop, except for /-b/ only in [ḏbb] and [ḏby]<sup>162</sup>, a fricative, except for /f/, /ʿ/ and /-h/ each in only one single PSem. trilateral: [ḏʿn], [ḏfr] and [ḏhr], as 2<sup>nd</sup> radical when the first is /ḡ/, /r/, /h/, etc.

5) In going back to [wṣl] above, its analysis reveals that it is a compound of at least three elements: \*w-, -šaW-, and \*-(ʿ)l-. The proot \*-šaW- is definitely from early PHS \*ḏaW- and is seen as \*ḏaW- or \*šaW- in numerous trilaterals. It is definite that the original meaning of \*ḏaW- here was “joining to, connection with”. The connection may be ‘physical’, hence “arrive at, reach, attain”; may be through ‘speech’, hence “speak to” (cf. *ḏuw* ~ *ṣuw*- “sound, voice, tumult”); may be through ‘blood relation’, through ‘girdle, rope’, through “word, pledge”, and so forth. The function of \*w- at this historical stage was probably to form a verb from a noun.

**2.12.2** CA *ṣifa*-tu “description, quality, attribute, adjective” > [wṣf]: *waṣafa* “to describe, depict”; imper. *ṣif!* “describe!”, Sab. *ʿṣf* “prescription, injunction” (SD, 8) = CA *waṣfa*-

---

However, notions of “fire”, “to kindle a fire”, and “to burn” can be expressed in HS by [ḥḏ-] and not by \*ḥṣ- or \*ḥṭ-: cf. CA *ḥaḏaʿa* = *ḥaḏaba* above, *ḥaḏaḡa* “make a fire burn”, etc.: Egyp. *ḥḏ* “to shine, become light” (EHD I, 522). In accordance with this fact, /-ṭ-/ is certainly from an earlier /-ḏ-/ as *waḥaṭa* “to strike, pierce with aspear” from *waḥaḏa* id. (see §3.10.10 above), etc. Note that the presence of [ḥṭb] in the entire HS languages (e.g. Ug. *ḥṭb* woodgatherer) does not change this fact, and that its presence is only an indication that /ḏ/ began to change to /ṭ/ in late PHS and only in some of its occurrences for ease of pronunciation. For a similar instance, see [bṭh] in §2.24.15, n. 3. below.

<sup>162</sup> The phonotactic rules governing the occurrence of /ḏ/ in roots support my view that HS [ḏby] “deer” is by metathesis from \*ḏyb, and that the masc. marker /-b/ is originally a suffix: see §2.23.8 below.

tu id., Meh. wəṣōf, Hars. weṣōf, Jib. ǝṣəf “to describe” (DRS VII, 594). To my understanding, CA [ʃnf] contains infixed \*-n-: ʃinfu “type, kind, class” also = ʃifa-tu (LA); ʃannafa “to classify things on the basis of type, kind, quality, attribute”.

**2.12.3** CA θiḳa-tu “trustworthy, reliable, dependable; trust, confidence” > [wθḳ] in CA waθiḳa “to entrust”; mīθāḳu “covenant”; ʾawθaḳa “to bind, tie”; waθāḳu “fetter, chain” as in the Koran (47:4): (فشدو الوثاق); mūθaḳu “tied” as in the PIP of Nabīyah:

«...wa mūθaḳin fī ḥibāli (ʾa)l ḳiddi maslūbi» (DN, p. 20, L. 8).

Sab. wθḳ “to entrust”, hwθḳ “to guarantee”, Min. štwθḳ “to guarantee” (= CA ʾistawθaḳa “make sure”), Ug. yθḳ “to bind, attach”, Aram.: Targ. wattīḳ “pious, faithful, excellent”, Te. wāššā “to tie, knot” (DRS VII, 660).

**2.12.4** Assyr. simtu “mark, characteristic, mark of distinction, ornament” ~ šimtu, šindu “mark” (Albright, JAOS, 47, 1927, n. 86), Egyp. sm-t “likeness, form; image” (EHD II, 666), CA sima-tu “distinctive mark, mark of distinction”, Sab. sm-t “mark, line, sign” (SD, 162) > [wsm]: CA wasama “to mark, brand”; wasuma “be handsome”, Akk. wasāmu “be fair, suitable”, Ug. ysm “pleasant”; ysm-t “beauty” (= CA wasāma-tu id.) (UG: 530), Min. mwšm “decorated”, Qat. wšm “marked” (DRS VII, 646) = CA muwassamu, muwaššamu, also mausūmu id. Also belong here CA wašama “to tattoo”; wašmu “a tattoo mark”, Sab. wšm “mark, sign”: PHS stem \*šim-.

Albright (JAOS 47, 1927: 232) tends to connect Semitic words above with Egyp. k’ “essence, double” (also denotes, like sm-t above, “form, image”) = Eth. kîy “self”, preserved with pronominal suffix kîyâya “myself”, BHeb. kî “mark” «*which Ember has happily combined with Egyp. ky-t “character, dignity” (in the Pyramid Texts). The original meaning of the word is “brand”, CA kayy (kawy), from kawâ (or kawaya) “to brand”*». He also considers Semitic \*kî, \*ka “like” as «*derived by contraction from the same word, since ‘mark’ is also ‘impression, likeness’*»: see CA šiyya-tu in §2.15.24 below.

1) One of the basic meanings of HS [kW-] is “thought; image” as in Egyp. k’î “to think, think out, devise, to speak”; k’t “thought”; k’ “image, character, person, phantom” (EHD II, 782, 783) perh. = BHeb. כִּי [r. kyw] in Am. 5, 26 “a statue, image” (OT, 463), SA: Jib. tǝ-kō, 2<sup>nd</sup> masc. sg. “penser, conclure” (DRS VI, 538).

**2.12.5** CA ḳira-tu “burden, heaviness”. LA states that it is said: «ʾallāhumma<sup>163</sup> (= O my

<sup>163</sup> The word ʾallāhumma (cf. Koran 26:3, 114:5, 32:8, 46:39) consists of ʾallāhu “God” and suffix \*-mma. What is the origin of the suffix \*-mma? O’Leary (1969:§94) considers it a demonstrative and connects it with /-ma/ in *halma* “come here”. The form *halma* is dialectal and the CA form is *halumma*. Old Arab scholars analyzed *halumma* as a compound of [hal] and [ʾumma], imper. “head to! come on!”, becoming, after dropping /-ʾ-/, *halumma*. See LA, r. [hlm] for further detail, and Ahmad Bin Faris’ Šāhibī, p. 179. Semitic cognates are Ug. hlm (hl, hlk, hln) “voici que”, hlñy “ici”, Heb. halom “ici”, Pun. alem id., OffAram. hlw id., etc. (DRS V, 408-409).

O’Leary also connects the CA suffix with Hadramaut prefixed /em-/, BHeb. suffixed /-ōm/ as in šilšōm “the day before yesterday”, and Eth. /-em/ as in temāl-em “yesterday”. For CA \*(ʾ)am, see

God) *ḵir* (make heavy!) *ʿuḡunahu* (of his ear)», also quoted Ibin Sīdihi as saying: «*wa mā ʿalaiya minka ḵira-tun*, i.e. *ʿay θiḵlun* (= heaviness)» (LA, r. wḵr); *ḵarra*, in talking to a deaf man, “put the mouth very close to one’s ear and repeat words aloud to make him hear” > [wḵr] as in *waḵira* “be/become deaf” = lit. “be heavy of hearing” as in the Koran: (وجعلنا على قلوبهم أكنة أن يفقهوه وفي آذانهم وقرا), *We have cast veils over their hearts lest they understand it, and a heaviness into their ears* (6:25); *wiḵru* “heavy burden or load”; *ʿawḵara* “to overburden, overload”, BHeb., BAram., Syr. *yḵr* “heavy” (OT, 420), Palm., JAram. *yḵr* id. (DRS VII, 610), OffAram. *yḵr* “make heavy; heavy” (NWSI I, 466f).

a) To the same traditional root also belong Egyp. *yḵr* “be excellent, precious, valuable” (EHD I, 93), OAkk. *aḵāru* “be dear” (Gelb, 1961: 184) also “be precious, expensive; to honor, respect, hold in esteem” (MD, 193), BHeb. *yāḵar* “precious, rare, costly”, Palm. *ʿwḵr* “to honor”, Jp. *yḵr* “be dear”, Syr. *yīḵar* “be precious, weighty” (DRS III, 610), OffAram. *yḵyr* “precious; honor” (NWSI ibid.), CA *waḵura* “be worthy of veneration or reverence, be weighty” < CA *ḵurra-tu* (dial. *ḵirra-tu*) often occurs with the word *ʿainu* “eye” and denotes “joy + mental relief” as in the Koran: (قرة عين لي ولك), *And said Pharaoh’s wife: (he is) a joy of the eye unto me and you*, (28:9), BHeb. *yḵr* “dear, beloved” also “splendid, beautiful” (OT, 420). The following fixed expression: *waḵaʿta bi ḵurri-ka* “you got what your heart desires” (LA, r. ḵr) may suggest that the underlying meaning of \*ḵur- is “love > heart”.

b) To my understanding, [wḵr], [ʿnḵ], [nwḵ] (§2.3.21 above), [twḵ], [šwḵ] (§2.7.34 above), etc. are based on the same proot.

**2.12.6** CA *siʿa-tu* “spaciousness, wideness, abundance”, Tham. *sʿt* “abundance” (Branden, 1950: 516) > [wsʿ]: CA *wasiʿa* “be wide, broad, to extend” as in the Koran: (وسع كرسیه السموات والأرض), *His throne extends over the heavens and the earth* (2: 255);

---

§2.22, n. 5c below.

As for CA *ʿallahumma*, Farāhīdī, Sibawayhi, and nearly all old Arab scholars consider final /-m/ in this word = *yā* at the beginning of a word = interjection ‘O’, and argue that while we can say: *yā ʿallāh* “O God”, we can’t say: \**yā ʿallahumma*. Accordingly, this makes /-m/ cognate with Egyp. *mī*, *an optative particle* “O that, would that” (EHD I, 292). For a different point of view on this CA suffix, see Ahmad Bin Faris ibid.

Apart from CA, SL *halumma* “come on (at once)” as in *halumma binā* = *haiyā binā* “(you sg. or pl.) let us go or hurry (at once)”. To my understanding, *hai-* “hurry”, \*-*yā* “an old vocative ending”, bi- “by, with”, -*nā* “us”: CA *haiyā!* “hurry!” (is understood as 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. sg., but it can be said to a group of people), *haiyak* “you hurry, move (-k = you masc. sg.)”. The origin of [hai, hayā] is, according to LA, *ʿayā*, *a vocative particle*. This type of interchange is quite common in CA and has already been illustrated. Its cognates in Semitic are Heb. *hēy* “voici!”, Talm. *hayāy* “vite!, va!”, SA: Meh. *heiya*, Soq. *heye* “allons!, vite!”, etc. (DRS V, 398). Such words may go back to [ʿay-] “come, go”, which is etymologically different from the vocative particle *yā* ~ *ʿayā*.

To sum up, /-m/ (-mm for emphasis) should not be identified with Heb. /-m/, for it has nothing to do with “before in time, afore, past”. Heb., etc. /-m/ seems to correspond to CA lam (i.e. l- “not, no” and -m “afore”) = *did not, was not*, the opposite of lan (i.e. l- “not, no” + -n “future”): see §2.22, n. 5c below.



wassa'a "to enlarge, expand", Sab. ws<sup>1'</sup> "to enlarge", OSA variants ws<sup>1'</sup> ~ ws<sup>3'</sup> occur in OSA (Stehle, JAOS 60, 526), BHeb. šw' by metathesis "be broad, ample" also yeša', yēša' [r. yš'] "broad place, wide room" (OT, 435, 1041).

a) The proot is seen in the trilateral [šs'] as in CA šāsi'u "far-stretching", a compound of [šW-] "far" and [si'].

b) There seems to be a connection between [s'] and saḥ- or sāḥ- "open space, etc.". Prefixing /w-/ to [šh] results in a sequence /\*wsh/ impossible to pronounce. For this reason, /-ḥ/ > /-'/ in Semitic, but /-ḥ/ in Egyp. wsh "be spacious or wide, to spread out, to empty" (HED I, 182). The proot /ḥ/ can be kept if /w-/ > /p-/ as in CA fašīḥ id. A word like \*fasī' can't be pronounced even slowly.

**2.12.7** Sab. hb-t "gift", Ge. habt id., Tham. hb id., CA hiba-tu "gift, grant", Akk. (i)b-imper. in (i)binna "give me" (= CA imper. habnī, SL hibnī id.) > [whb]: in OAram., OffAram., Hatra, Palm., JAram., Nab. yhb "to give", BHeb. hab, hābā "give!", Ge. wahaba "to give" (NWSI I, 442ff; DRS VI, 504), CA wahaba "to grant, bestow on", Tham. whb "to give, grant" (Branden, 1950: 513), Sab. whb "to grant, give" (SD, 158-159).

**2.12.8** CA ḡiha-tu "front; side, direction, aspect"; ḡāhu "magnanimity, notability, glory" > [wḡh]: waḡhu "face" also "façade or cheek" as in waḡhu 'al-Ka'bati id. (LA, r. wḡh); waḡḡaha "to head to, i.e. *direct the face toward*"; waḡuha "be a person of distinction, be a notable person"; waḡāha-tu "the quality of being notable" (see §2.11.39 above). One may suffix /-m/ to [ḡah-] and get ḡahama "to frown".

**2.12.9** Sab. s<sup>3</sup>ḵ-t "pregnancy" (SD, 164): CA wasaḵa "be pregnant" (a female animal) as a n. wasḵu, also Sab. hws<sup>3</sup>ḵn "fill in a wall", Min. wsḵ "charge d'âne" (DRS VII, 571-572) = CA wasḵu id.

**2.12.10** BHeb. 'šh "counsel, advice; wisdom, etc.", CA 'ida-tu "sermon, preaching, advice" (OT, 807), Sab. 'd-t "demand, summons, call", OffAram., DAram. 'šh "counsel" (NWSI, II, 880) > [w'd]: CA wa'aḏa "to deliver a sermon, preach"; imper. 'id-hu! "preach him!", Sab. w'd-m "legal claim, demand" (SD, 155), OffAram., Pun. y's "to advise" (NWSI I, 464), BHeb. yā'aš, BAram., Jp. y't id. (DRS VII, 575).

It is possible that Sab. r'd "command, authority" (SD, 113) is based on [r'd] (see §2.15 below).

**2.12.11** Akk. šittu (\*šin-tu) "sleep", OAram. šn-t id., Syr. sentā id. (DRS VII, 647; Rabin, 1975: 89, 92, n. 77), Sab. s'n-t "sleep" (SD, 163), Ug. šn-t id. (UG, 536), Phoen. šn "sleep" (PG. 107), CA sina-tu "drowsiness, slumber" (Koran 2: 225) > [wsn]: wasina "be drowsy, sleepy", Ug. wšn "to sleep", Phoen. yšn id., BHeb. yāšēn "be asleep", Chad.: Bolewa sunu "to sleep", Tangale sine, Ngamo sun, Glm san, Miya, Mbu sən, Gera sin "to sleep", Logone san, Chibak sini "to dream", Mbara saṇ, Daba šini "to dream", Lele sōn "to sleep, to dream", Mubi suno id.; Cush.: Saho, Afar sonoo "sleep" (HSED, n., 2226; Carnochan, 1975: 465).

**2.12.12** Sab. *ḵh-t* “command, order, authority; work, job, assigned task” (SD, 161), Qat. *ḵht* “order, command” (DRS VII, 603), CA *ḵāhu* (< \**ḵīha-tu* < \**ḵīha-tu*) “obedience” also “authority, power” as in *Hadith*: «*mālī ‘indahu ḡāhun wa lā lī ‘alaihi ḵāhun*».

1) The word is traced by Zamahshari to [*ḵyh*] and by Ibin Athīr to *ḵuwwah* [r. *ḵwy*] “strength, power” (LA, r. *ḵyh*). Jawhari (SHH VI, 2245-2246) derives the word from [*ḵwh*]. In fact all such trilaterals, in addition to [*ḵhw*], [*ḵhy*], etc. expresses the same sort of meaning as in *ḵāhī* “intrepid”. In addition, *ḵāhu* “obedience” also “authority, power”. We may also add [*yḵh*] as in poet. (of Muhbbal):

«...wa *’istayḵahu* lilmuḥallimi» (Jawhari ibid., r. *ḵwh*, but LA, r. *ḵyh*).

In the verse of poetry above *’istayḵahu*, as it stands, is definitely CX of [*yḵh*]. To be from [*ḵyh*] and/or [*ḵwh*], it should have been *’istayḵyahu* or *’istayḵwahu* respectively. According to Ahmad Bin Faris (ML VI, 157), the trilateral [*yḵh*] expresses “to understand” and this notion is derived from “obedience”.

2) For what concerns the root [*ḵw*] above, it expresses “power, strength” as in BHeb. *ḵāwā(h)* “to be strong, robust”, CA *ḵawīya* id.; *ḵuwwa-tu* “strength” (OT, 917), etc. Even here we find some derivatives expressing the notion ‘obedience’ as in Sab. *ḵtw* in *mḵtwyn*, *mḵtwy* “steward” (SD, 109), CA CVIII *’iḵtawā* “to become a servant”; *ḵatwu* “serving”; *maḵtawī* “servant; slave” as in the PIP of ‘Umar Bin Kalthum:

«*matā kunnā li ’ummika ma-ḵtawī-nā*».

It should be noted, however, that *maḵtawīna* also expresses a contradictory meaning ‘master’ as in Poet.

«’arā ‘amru bina ṣīrmat *maḵtawīnā*...» (Anbārī’s *Kitābu Al Aḏḏād*, n. 67).

3) With prefixed *w-*: Sab. *wḵh* “to command”; *tḵh* (\**twḵh*) “to complete a task”, Min. *ṣtwḵh* “be in charge of” (DRS III, 603), CA *waḵiha* “to obey”, BHeb. *yḵh* “obedience” (OT, 419), Assy. *aḵu* “to fear, reverence, be obedient” (King, 1898: 323). CA also has a variant [*yḵh*] above.

4) To this proot certainly belongs CA *ḵa’ā* (\**ḵahā*) “to humiliate oneself and admit an enemy’s right”. It should be noted that the notion “work, job, assigned task”, as expressed by Sab. *ḵh-t* above, is implied in CA *ḵāhu*, said of people, “help one another in an assigned task or work”, and is derived from the notion ‘obedience’, according to LA ibid.

The notion ‘obedience’ develops from “authority, power”. The fixed expression «*mā lī ‘alaihi ḵāhun*» = I have no power over him; therefore = *I cannot make him obedient* (LA; MA, 343). Additional evidence comes from the expression «’*innā* (= verily we are) *’ahlu* (people of) *ḵāhin* (= obedience)», whose surface meaning is “we are obedient people”, but the deep meaning is to be sure “we obey whoever rules us”.

**2.12.13** CA *ḏī’a-tu* “humbleness, humiliation” < [*wḏ’*]: CA *waḏa’a* “to place, put” also “humble, humiliate”, Sab. *wḏ’* “to humiliate s.o., be stationed, to reside” (SD, 157) also “to set down, humble”, OSA *wṣ’* “be humbled, destroyed” (Stehle, JAOS 60, 1940: 518), BHeb. *yaṣṣā’a* “to lay in the bed; bed”, etc. see DRS VII, 598. The biliteral is seen in CA *ḏa’ḏa’a* “to humble, put down”, Berb.: Kab. *ḏu’* “to obey” (see §2.11.75 above). It is unlikely that Egyp. *d’* “to place, put”; *s-d’* caus. “to lay, place” (EHD II, 631)

belongs here.

**2.12.14** Akk. šub-tu “dwelling, abode” (AG, 105), Ug. θb-t “dwelling” (UG, 530), Sab. θb-t “shrine” (SD, 165): CA \*θiba-tu > \*θibāba-tu > θibābu “sitting”; θabθaba, by reduplication, “to sit firmly”, according to Abu Omar (see LA, r. θb) > [wθb] “to sit, dwell”, Akk. wašābu “to sit, dwell”, OAram. yšb (ytb) “to sit, stay, reside; settle”, Moab., Phoen., Pun. yšb, Ug. yθb “to sit”, OffAram, BAram., Palm. ytb, EHeb. yāšab, Min. wθb “to sit, reside” (NWSI I, 473ff; DRS VII, 656; Dupont-Sommer, AG, 4), Sab. wθb “to sit, settle, reside”; mwθb “seat, residence”. In CA the trilateral is preserved in *wiθābu* “seat(s)” and *mīθābu* (i.e. *miwθābu*) “sitting”, and occurs with the meaning “to sit” one time in *Hadith* and another in prose (LA *ibid.*) = Egyp. ’ysb “seat, throne, something fixed” (EHD I, 1). All are from a word θab-.

To PHS stem [θab-] belong with various suffixes BHeb. šebet “to sit, dwell” (OT, 1034), CA θabata “be firm, fixed, stable”, with the prep. ’alā “to abide by”, CII θabbata “to stabilize, fix firmly”; θābitu “established, permanent, stationary” (§2.9.15 above), with r-ext.: CA θābara “to persevere or persist in”; θabara “to confine; jail”, with t-ext.: CA θabaṭa “to confine, jail”, with y-ext.: θabbā “to persevere in” also “safeguard, protect”. The proot is doubtless present in such CA words as *suddatu*, *wisādatu*, *ta-wassada* and their HS cognates (§2.1.14.2, n. 3 above).

1) CA waθaba above also expresses an opposite meaning “to jump, rise” (imper. *θib!* “jump!”). This meaning is the only common one in CA, MSA, and all modern dialects.

A careful examination of CA [θab] “to sit firmly” and its antonym [wθb] “to jump, rise” reveals that either (a) the two words are from an earlier [θab-] or (b) they belong to two different origins. The second possibility must be ruled out because, as shown above, some derivatives of CA [waθab] also have to do with “to sit”. It can thus be said that the trilateral [waθab] itself, like very numerous others, expresses two contradictory meanings in CA. The ultimate origins of [wθb<sup>1</sup>] and [wθb<sup>2</sup>], which differ from each other in the etymology of /w-/, are as follows:

1) CA, etc. waθaba “to sit, dwell” is originally a complex word consisting of [wa-], [θau-], and [-b-]. The 2<sup>nd</sup> element is seen in CA θawā “to dwell or reside in a place for a long period of time” (comp. θabθaba “to sit firmly” above); ma-θwā “house, abode” as in the Koran (3:150): (وبئس مثوى الظالمين) and θāwī “dweller”; θawā’u “dwelling” as in the PIP of Harith Bin Hillizah:

«’āḍanatnā bi bainihā ’asmā’u

rubba θāwin yumallu minhu (’a)θ θawā’u» (Š & Š, p. 111, L. 1).

The final [-b] is either a prep.: gen. Sem. bi “in” or from HS \*baW- “place, house”<sup>164</sup>.

2) Before moving on to pinpoint the origin of [wa-] in [waθaba] “to jump”, I find myself obliged to clarify the special meaning of “jump” for two purpose: (a) *to show that ‘jump’ is here the exact antonym of ‘sit’*, and (b) *to appreciate the unmatched conservatism of CA*. The word *waθaba* has tens of synonyms in CA, with each has its distinct meaning or special use as in *ṭumūru* “a jump from a higher to lower position”, *ṭafṭu* expresses an opposite meaning, i.e. *a jump from a lower to higher position*, *ḍabara*

<sup>164</sup> OAram. by(t), Ug., Moab. bt, etc. “house”, Egyp. b, b’, etc. (§2.9.22 above).

“jump while running”, *ḳafaza* “to jump over, as a fence”, *ḳaḥaza* “to jump + be restless”, and so on.

If one is in a sitting position or pretending to be in a sitting position or in a position looking like a sitting position, then he suddenly jumps we say *waṭaba*. Thus, one can use *waṭaba* to describe *a crouching lion jumping on its prey*.

It appears almost evident that CA initial /wa-/ is a neg. element, an element that is exceedingly rare even in OEgypt. (see §2.21 below).

3) Final [-b] of HS [wṭb] is originally a locative prep., and the earliest compound [ṭau + ba] has been preserved in all Sem. languages as in CA *ṭāba* “to return, come back”, orig. *come back home*; *maṭābu* (masc.) ~ *maṭāba-tu* (fem.) “home, dwelling” as in the Koran: *مَثَابَةٌ وَأَمْنًا* (LA), Ug. *ṭwb* “to return”; *mṭb* “dwelling” (UG, 532, 535), Assyr. *mūšabu id.* (King, 1898: 325), Pun. *mṭb* “inhabitant” (NWSI II, 698), OAram. *šwb* “to return”, Moab., BHeb. *šūb* “to return, come back” (NWSI II, 1114f), BAram. *twb id.* (Rosenthal, 1963: 98), Sab. *ṭwb* “to repulse” also “execute or complete construction” (SD, 151) as well as “to return” (Stehle, JAOS, 1960: 527), and in a personal name *ṭb'l* = Amarna Canaanite *ša-bi-lu* “El has returned” (Shehadeh, 1962: 151).

4) An almost identical instance is Semitic \*'wb as in CA *'āba* “to return home, come back (home) in the evening” as in the PIP of Ubaid Bin Aḥas:

«wa kullu ḏī yaibatin ya-'ūbu ... , i.e. *come back home*.

This very same signification is evident in the PIP of 'Amr Bin Kalthum:

«fa 'ābu bi ('a)l nihābi wa bi('a)ssabāya

wa 'ubnā bi ('a)l mulūki mušaffadīnā» (JAA, p. 292, L. 78).

In this verse the verb is used twice and denotes “come back to one’s territory or tribe, i.e. *home, after the raid*. Moreover, *'āba*, said of the sun “to set, i.e. *return to the place from which it rises*”; *the place was then commonly believed to be its 'home*”; *'aubu* “bees” so-called, according to *Abu Hanifah* (in LA, r. 'wb), because «*they come back to their mabā'a-tu* (i.e. *'house*', here *'hive*')» (also see *nawbu* in §2.17.39 below), Šaf. 'b “to return” (DRS I, 11), and perhaps Sab. 'by “permanent residence in a place” (SD, 1).

5) Semitic \*'wb, like \*ṭwb above, is a compound composed of \*'w- and \*b(y)-. The first element is seen in CA *'āwā* “to seek shelter, take lodging, lodge” also “to return, come back”; *ma'wā* “lodging, dwelling”: PIP Labid says:

«'āwai-tuhu ḥattā takaffata ḥāmīdan...» (DL, p. 161, L. 1).

Lih. 'w- “to seek shelter, to lodge”, OAram. 'wyn, with suffixed -n becoming part of the root, “to seek refuge, seek shelter”, Syr. 'awwānā “residence, inn”, Mand. awana “dwelling place, quarter, enclosure”, Palm., Nab. 'wn “abode, habitation” (DRS I, 12; NWSI I, 22). In CA, however, the same -n serves to form a noun: 'īwānu “large room”, Egypt. yw, yī “house” (EHD I, 32) ~ 'wy, Cop. ēi “room, house” (Hodge, 1975: 180; ywn “inner chamber”, ywnnw “abode, home” (EHD I, 34), Chad.: Kariya iyu “place”, Cagu, Mburku yī id. (HSED, n. 2590). Shifting suffixed /-n/ to initial position gives rise to a new Semitic trilateral expressing the same meaning (see for other instances, see §2.8.22, n. 5 above).

**2.12.15** CA *fira-tu* “abundance, plenty, affluence” > *wafura*, *wafara* “be abundant” also “to grow, increase, save”; *wafra-tu* “abundance, wealth, affluence, riches”; *wafiru* adj.,

SA: Qat. wfr “amasser”, Ge. wafara “être gras, devenir gras”, Amh. wäffärä “être gras, gros, volumineux”, Gaf. wfr “(homme) au gros ventre”, Te. wäfära “grande foule” (DRS VII, 588-589).

A scientific investigation that aims at determining the deep proot underlying [wpr] must take into consideration its kindred [wfy], which has in common with it both the first two radicals and a similar semantic content. There are, of course, other trilaterals beginning with \*wp-. Some of such roots have already been studied (e.g. see §2.11.39, n. 1 above) or will be studied below, while some others have nothing to do with the proot under study like [wpd] in §§2.12.30 & 2.12.31 below, [wpz] in §2.12.22 below.

1) Semitic \*wpy- is in CA wafā “be plenty, abundant, much/may, complete; full, perfect, faithful, just”; CIV ’awfā “be more (than)”; wafā “be like”; CII waffā “make complete, fulfill an obligation”; CX imperf. yastawfī “to recover a debt, get back (a debt), make complete, fulfill”; Lih. CX ystfy “to recover a debt, pay a debt, make complete”, Ge. wafaya “to offer, grant”, Te. ’awfa “to complete”, Sab. wfy “to pay a debt, fulfill an obligation, accomplish”; hwfy, hfy, caus. “to grant, bestow, offer”, wf’ “to furnish supplies”, Qat. wfy, Min. šwfy id., etc. (DRS VII, 584; SD, 157, 157), Chad.: Fye, Bokkos fa “to give”, Mafa, Logone va, Buduma we id. (HSED, n. 1129) = CA fā’a id. (see n. 3 below).

It should be noted that the idea expressed by Sab. wfy as well as by CA and Lih. CX forms above = CA CX ’istaufara [r. wfr] above “to recover a debt, get back (a debt)”. For the notion “make complete” expressed by [wfy] above: cf. CA maufūru “complete, perfect, full”. Similarly, Har. wāfāša “have abundant hair”, Cush.: Ga. wāfa gor’āti id. (HED, 158) = CA wafra-tu “abundant hair”. As for [wfy] “abundance”, etc. above = CA wafra-tu “abundance, plenty”, etc. above.

2) Our examination of trilaterals [wfr] and [wfy] shows clearly that they are both derived from a single underlying form. Let us assume tentatively that the form is \*wap-, meaning “riches, abundance, splendor” as a verb “be rich, abundant, splendid, beautiful”. The form is seen in all other Semitic languages, as in BHeb. yapā(h) “be beautiful, to shine; splendor” (OT, 412-413), Ug. yp “beauty” (UG, 530), Phoen. yp’ “to shine” (PG, 121), Akk. (w)apū “be or become manifest, visible”, Pun. yp’ “fitting” Syr. pī “be beautiful, pleasant”; ’awpī “to complete, finish” (DRS VII, 584), Assy. apū “to shine forth; praise, glorify”; šūpū “bright, brilliant, glorious” (King, 1898: 322-323), also CA wafā’u «*means in the language ‘glorious and sublime character’*» (LA, r. wfy) also “fidelity, loyalty, fulfillment of”. For the notion “beautiful”, also see CA \*fy- below.

We have thus far seen that the tentative stem \*wap- expresses such related ideas like “riches, splendor, hair, to bestow, offer, make complete or perfect”. As to the idea “pay a debt, get back a debt”, it is from “be just, right, make complete or perfect”. All such ideas and others are actually connoted by PHS \*pai- (or \*py-) as in CA fai’u “booty, spoils” also “tax” (i.e. riches); CIV ’afā’a “bestow upon, grant” also “to take as booty” as in the Koran: (وما أفاء الله على رسوله), *whatever has God bestowed on his apostle* (59: 7); fai’u “giving to relatives”; fai’u, in *Hadith*, “hair”; fai’u “shade”; fā’-at, said of a tree, “extend its shade”, lit. “be abundant (shade)” (LA, r. fy’), Sab. fy’ “to take as booty” (SD, 47), Har. fāya “be satisfied”, Ed. faya barā, Go., Z. fäyya, S., W. fäyya honā

“be healthy” (HED, 66). In Egyp. we find *fyw* “riches” also “gladness”; *fy-t* “offering” as in *fyi* (ḥd) “to present an offering (of silver)” (EHD I, 259), Berb.: Shil. *fi* “to give” (Applegate, 1958: 52). Also belong here Egyp. *fy*, Copt. *pô* “hair” = CA *fai’u* id. above. The notion of “hair”, or more precisely, “beautiful hair”, may also be expressed in CA by suffixing /-n/ to \**fy*: *fainānu* “beautiful hair”.

3) For Egyp. *f’-t* (from \**fy’-t*) “interest on money” (EHD *ibid.*) = CA *fā’ida-tu* id.: *pai’u* “tax”. Here belongs Sab. *fyd*, with prep. *l-* = to, “belong exclusively to s.o.” (SD, 47) = CA *fāda* with prep. *l-* “be established (money) to belong to s.o.”

CA *fā’ida-tu*, fem., “interest (on money), profit, benefit” is a compound of \**fai-* (i.e. \**fy-*) “interest, benefit” as a vb “give” (CA *fai’u* “land-tax”) and \**-d* (from an earlier *-t*: see §3.9 above).

4) Cohen (DRS VII, 586) also connects Akk. (w)apū above with BHeb. *hōpīa’* “éclairer, faire briller, faire apparaître”, Aram.: Jp. *yp’* “apparaître”, and derives them from \**wp’*. He says:

*«L’akk. á été rattaché hypothétiquement à WPY... Certain noms propres amorites comportent l’élément \*ypḥ qui peut dépendre de la valeur “être brillant” ou de celle de “être élevé”».*

The CA cognate with BHeb., Aram., and Amorite words is the triliteral [*yf’*] as in CV *tayaffa’a* “to kindle a fire in an overlooking mountain”; CIV *’ayfa’a* “to rise, elevate”; *yafā’u* “overlooking mountain or hill” (LA) = Sab. *yf’* “to go up to; rise, spring (stream)” (SD, 168), Ug. *yp’* “to rise” (UG, 535). This Semitic triliteral may be related to or based on \**pa’-* as in CA *fā’ū-sa-tu* “fire without flame”, DA *yp’* “blazing fire” (NWSI I, 464), Egyp. *p’* “fire, flame, spark” (EHD I, 234), Chad.: Daba *pay* “dawn”, Gid *pāya* “sun”, Cush.: Oromo *ifa* “to shine” (HSED, 539).

5) Returning to Eth. *fay-* “be healthy” in (3) above, we find Cush. *fay-* expresses an identical meaning as in Som., Ga. *fay* id. The same notion is expressed in CA by [*’fy*] “be healthy” as in *ta-’āfā* “regain one’s health, i.e. ‘recover one’s health’”, OffAram. *’py* perhaps “stay unharmed” (NWSI II, 879), Mand. *apa* “be healed, cured” (MD, 30), Chad.: Gava *’ufa*, Nakaci *wufa* “heal, cure”, Mubi *afi* “health” (HSED, n. 1047, 1120). Chad.: Mubi “health”. This a compound of proot [*’a’*] (see §2.14 below) and proot [*paW*].

To my understanding, the proot (\**py-*) lies beneath many more HS trilaterals like [*špy*] in CA *šafā* “to cure” as a n. *šifā’u*, [*rpy*] in [*rp’*] “shade” (see §§2.15.18 & 2.14.17 below), etc.

**3.12.16** CA *waḍama* “to bring closely together” (SL *laḍam* id., where /*la-*/ is a prefix) < *ḍimāma-tu* “bundle; package” ~ *ḍimma-tu* id. < \**ḍima-tu*: *ḍamma* “conjoin, join, to gather together, amalgamate, unite”, BHeb. *šmm*, *obsol.*, “to braid, bind”, hence *מִשְׁמָר* “snare” (OT, 897), Ge. *ḍmm* “to join, bind”, Chad.: Buli *šemu*, Jimbin *šim*, Suri *šim*, Migama *ḍyimmo*, Mubi *’žeme-ge* “to sew” (HSED, n. 586).

An important Semitic triliteral, namely [*ḍmd*], belongs here. The triliteral is in OAkk. *šimdu*, Bab. *šamadāni* “span”, *šamadu* “to bind together, harness”, Ug. *šmd* “yoke, rod”, Phoen. (s)*smdt* “span of oxen”, Heb. *šemed* “span; couple”, Aram. *šimdā* “yoke (for oxen)” and “pair joined by a yoke”, CA *miḍmada-tu* inst. “a yoke”; *ḍamada* “to join

together”, ESA dmd “to couple, to join”, Ge. dēmd “yoke, pair, cart harnessed with a pair of animal”, Har. šāmāda “lay the yoke”; řindi “pair of oxen, pair”, Tna. šāmadā, Te. šāmāda, Amh. řāmmādā id., Cush.: Dar. řamade id. (Tyloch, 1975: 59, n. 31; HED, 154-155). All are from a proot [daw-] seen in CA as in CVII řindawā “be joined to, be united with” = CVII řindamma, with a slight difference in use<sup>165</sup>.

### Comments

Among other compound words based partly on [dam] is CA řimna “within, inside” as a vb řammana “to have within, inclose in”. The word consists of [dam] plus the prep. [-n] “in”: see ř2.11, n. 7 above.

**2.12.17** Akk. emēřum “soigner, prender soin de” (DRS VII, 558), CA wamiřa “to love” (Al řayn V, 233): CA miřa-tu fem. “love, affection”.

1) The chief god of the Sabaeans is řlmřh, «of which- Barton (1934: 207) tells- *we know neither the vocalization nor the meaning*». Barton finds that the position held by řlmřh among the Sabaeans is analogous to that held by Wadd among the Minaeans, and by řmm among the Qatabanians: «*The Minaeans are said to be the children of Wadd; the Sabaeans of Al-mařřahu; the Qatabanians of řamm*» (p. 208).

1a) There is no doubt that Sab. řlmřh is a compound of \*řl- = CA řal of tařřim (see below) and \*mřh, which may be from either (a) \*mu-/mi-řahu “mighty” (see ř2.12.12 above) also in CA řāh- “welfare”, or (b) \*mař- “love” (see below). The latter choice suggests that both ‘*deities*’ of the Sabaeans and Minaeans denote “love”: cf. Ug. yd “love” (UG, 534), BHeb. yādīd “lovely” (OT, 379), CA wuddu, widdu, waddu “love”, Tham. wdd id. (Branden, 1950: 513), etc. The phonological structure of the Sab. word plainly tells that it from {řal mu řhu} “The mighty” or “the one who loves”.

1b) In pre-Islamic Arabia Wuddu was the deity of some tribes, esp. *Kuraish and Kalb*, hence the pre-Islamic pers. name řabdu wudd “Slave (of) Wudd” is analogous to the Islamic řabdu llāhi “Slave (of) God”. It is the first of the five deities occurring in this Koranic verse (71: 23): (ولا تذرن ودا ولا سواعا ويعوق<sup>166</sup> ويغوت ونسرا). As for [řmm], it is from the root in Akk. ammu “paternal uncle”, CA řammu “paternal uncle” also “a great multitude, community, people” with řamamu “perfect”; řāmmu “general, common to all; populace”, BHeb. řmm “paternal uncle, a great multitude, people”, Phoen., Moab., OAram., OffAram., Hatra řm “people” (NWSI II, 865-866).

Before closing this section, I find it necessary to add that prefixing \*řal- to a proper

<sup>165</sup> *Is Sem. [-d] above a term for ‘two’?* The view that /-d/ = ‘two’ is based on CA řimdu, which expresses two opposing notions “big & small, good & bad, best and worst”; řamdu (said of man or woman) “having two boy-friends/girl-friends at the same time” also “having a girl-friend/boy-friend besides one’s husband/wife”.

It is possible that Egyp. gbd “two arms” includes this /-d/: cf. gřb “arm” (EHD II, 802, 806). The Egyp. word finds its cognate in SL and other dialects: ta-řabbad “to open the arms, *as in yawning*”. Terms for ‘two’ will be studied in ř2.17.19-2.17.23 below.

<sup>166</sup> It seems that yařūř is a compound of ya- “belonging to, connected with”, řa = “great”, and \*ř = either “food” (see ř2.14.17 below) or “mighty”.

noun in Sab. finds a parallel in CA, and a shining example is *'al-lāh* “God”, i.e. *the God*. Other examples are *'al-Lāt* and *'al-'Uzzā*. This /'al/ is not the definite article, but rather *'al* of *ta'ḏīm* = *magnificence, greatness* as in *'al Fayṣal* = *Fayṣal the Magnificent or the Great*.

2) In going back to Semitic [wmk] we find that Semitic [dmk], with prefixed \*d-, is based on [mak]. The trilateral is seen in Akk.-Assyr. *dumḫu* ~ *dunḫu* “favor, comeliness, good fortune”; *damāḫu* “be pleasant, favorable, pleasing”; *damḫ-* “good, beautiful”, Ug. *dmḫ* “good”, Tna. *dāmākā* “être beau, brillant”, Ge. *'admaḫa* “orner, embellir”, etc. (DRS IV, 276; Rabin, 1975: 88; King, 1898: 344). The /-m-/ interchanges with /-n-/ in various Eth. dialects as in Tna., Amh. *dnḫ* “be marvelous”, etc. (HED, 56-57). The exact CA cognate is seen in a letter written by Khalid to Omar: «'inna 'an-nāsa ḫad **damāḫū** fī 'al ḥamri...», where *damāḫū* signifies, according to Shamir, “(they = -ū) *indulge a carving for and be delighted to an excessive degree*” (LA).

3) The reason for which I consider [dmk] as being formed from \*d- and \*-mak is simple. Take the same caus. d- and prefix it to \*wad- above and you will get the same sort of meaning: cf. Akk. *dād-* “cour (amoureuse), chéri, bien-aimé”, Ug. *dd* “amour, aimé”, etc. (DRS IV, 232), DAram. *dd-n* pl. (joy of) love” (NWSI I, 241), Har. *dād* “love, affection”, Cush.: Ga. *dada* “agreement” (HED, 53). This word may be present in CA *dadu* “fun, amusement, enjoying oneself, playing music” (= *daida* ~ *daidānu* ~ *dadānu* ~ *daidabūn*). Here also belong OffAram., Palm., Hatra, Nab. *dd* (\*dwd) “paternal uncle”, Moab. *dwd* perh. “deity, champion” (NWSI I, 241-243). For caus. d-, from *da'*, see §2.1.6.5ff above.

**2.12.18** CA *ḥida-tu* “aloneness, privacy”, OAram. *ḥd* “one” (AG, 3) > Tham. *wḥd* “be alone” (Branden, 1950: 513), CA *waḥida* “be alone”; *waḥḥada* “to unite”; *wāḥidu* “one, unique”; *waḥīdu* “alone, unique”, 'aḥadu “someone, one, unique”, BHeb. 'eḥād id.; *yāḥad* “to unite”, BAram., Syr. *ḥad* “one” (OT, 31f), Assy. *edu* “one, alone” (King, 1898: 327), Ug. *aḥd*, Eth. 'aḥadu “one” (Moscatti, 1969:116). PHS word \*ḥad- “alone”<sup>167</sup>.

1) Higher ordinal numerals involving “first” show a strange phenomenon in CA. The form is consistently *ḥādī* ~ *ḥādiya* with a stem {Fāḫī}, and never 'aḥada (Sibawayhi's Kitab II, 172) as in *ḥādī* (or *ḥādiya*) 'ašra “the eleventh” (cf. BHeb. 'aḥad 'āšār, etc.), *ḥādī wa 'al-'išrūna*, i.e. lit. *first and the twenty* “the twenty-first”, etc. Old Arab grammarians like Farāḥīdī (Al 'Ayn III, 281) and Ibin Jinni (Khaṣā'iṣ II, 78) ascribed this phenomenon to metathesis in either the number: *wḥd* > \*ḥdw > \*ḥdy, i.e. *from stem FāḫiLu* > *ḫāLiFu*, or in the verb, i.e. *waḥada-t* > \*ḥadawa-t. The form is also seen without \*w- in the fixed expressions «*ḥudyā* ('a)n-nās», *one of the people*, and «'anā *ḥudyā-ka*...», etc. (LA).

It may be interesting to note that in CA ordinal numerals from 1-10 can drop the third radical, hence 'al *wāḥi*(d) “the first”, 'aθ *θālī*(θ) “the third”, 'as *sābi*(') “the seventh” ('al

<sup>167</sup> It is possible that CA *ḫāḥidu* “one” with *ḫaḥḥadu* “lone man with no brothers or children” is a compound based on \*ḥad “lone, alone”. It is equally possible that *ḥadalu* “with one testicle (a human being or animal)” is also built on \*ḥad-.



~ 'aθ ~ 'as = the), and so forth (Jamharah III, 1311).

By examining all CA words with a stem {Fāḡī}, however, we find that they are in their entirety derived from trilaterals whose final and sometimes middle radical consonants are weak, i.e. *either* /y/ or /w/, e.g. rādī [r. rdy] “satisfied”<sup>168</sup>, wāfī [r. wfy] “complete”, ḥāfī [r. hfy] “hidden”, ‘ādī [r. ‘wd] “normal, habitual”, and so forth. This evidence correctly indicates that the number *must be* from either \*ḥaw-d or \*ḥadw/-y: comp. JAram., Nab. ḥwd “solitude, only, exclusively” (NWSI I, 352-353). In CA the corresponding trilateral [ḥwd] may be a variant of [‘wd] as tu-‘āwīdu ~ tu-ḥāwīdu “to visit” (Palm. ‘wd “to visit”: cf. NWSI II, 831), from ‘āda “to come back” also “to repeat”. Azhari said (in LA, r. ‘wd): ‘awda-tu *fem.* “coming back or returning one time or once”. Bin Faris defines [‘wd] as “something done twice” and quotes Farāḥīdī as defining ‘awdu بعد الأمر , lit. “doing something twice; returning after starting” (ML IV, 181); CIV ‘a‘āda “to repeat, do again, reiterate”, Sab. [‘wd] in ‘d “to return to a place”; ‘d adv. “again” (SD, 22), BHeb. ‘ōd “again; repeatedly; yet (again)” (OT, 755f).

2) Apart from the phonetic nature of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> radicals of the number whether it is [wḥd], [ḥwd] or [‘wd], the fact to be first recognized is that the number under focus, like any number in the language without any exception, orig. denoted a special meaning, i.e. *one of x*, where *x* may be ‘kind or number’, i.e. *one of a kind, one of a number*: 2, 3, 7, etc., or a coll. *n*.

The second fact to be recognized is that CA has preserved many terms expressing ‘one, first’ in the sense outlined above, and that some of such numbers are found in some HS language divisions: see §§2.17.19-2.17.25 below.

**3.12.19** CA wabadu “poverty and wretchedness”; wabdu “destitution”; wabida “be worn out (of a garment)” (see §2.3.3 above).

**2.12.20** CA watana “to dwell, abide”, said of water “to stagnate”, i.e. *dwell, be fixed in a place*; wātinu “lasting, continuous”, said of the rain, “continuous rain” = Sab. mh-wtn-m “continuous rain” (§2.3.43 above), Heb. yāten “être constant”; ‘ētān “pérenne, permanent” (DRS VII, 652). The proot is seen with various ext.:

a) CA tāniḥu [tnḥ] “dweller, inhabitant, tenant”, tana’a [tn’] “to dwell, reside or live in a place”, hence tāni’u “dweller in a place, inhabitant, tenant” = Egyp. tnnw, pl., “tenant” (EHD II, 838) = BHeb. tanō-t, pl. “dwelling” = CA tinā’a-tu (~ tanā’a-tu, from \*tanū’atu) id. (OT, 1110).

b) CA tanna [tn] also tanā [tny] “to dwell (in a place)”, Chad.: Tala ten “to sit” (HSED, n. 2562). It is to be noted that the replacement of initial /w-/ in watana by /’-/ does not make any difference in meaning, hence CA ‘atana id. (Al ‘ayn VIII, 137).

An ultimate connection between PHS words \*tn and \*dn ~ ṭn should not be dismissed. The latter is seen in Egyp. as in dn-t “abode, chamber”. In Semitic, the proot \*dn- is found with prefixes as in Semitic \*‘dn in CA, BHeb. ‘dn “Eden” (the city of Adan in Yeman), as a verb CA ‘adana “to dwell in a place”, derived from Adan, whose initial voiced pharyngeal /’-/ = ‘*great*’ (§3.14 below). Semitic \*mdn (m- = place: cf.

<sup>168</sup> Sab. rdy “to satisfy, please” (SD, 115), EHeb., OffAram. ršy “be satisfied, to want” (NWSI II, 1082), etc.

§3.10 above) as in CA *madīna-tu* “city”, i.e. *place of the city*, EHeb., OffAram., Palm., Nab. *mdn-h* “city, town, state” (NWSI II, 597), etc. Phoen. *ṭnʿ* “to dwell, establish” (Bustani, 1985: 65), CA *ṭanʿu* [ṭnʿ] “home”, *ṭanā* [ṭnw] id., *ma-wṭinu* “homeland”; *waṭanu* “one’s native land”, Sab. *mwṭn* “camp, field” (SD, 166), but in other OSA dialects *m-wḏn* “homeland, habitation” (Stelhe, JAOS, vol. 60: 517), OAram., OffAram., etc. *mt* “land, town” (NWSI II, 706), etc. all are from [ta- ~ da- ~ ṭa-] “earth, place”. See both §2.1.6.5.25 above and §2.17.29 below.

**2.12.21** CA *wabata* “to dwell, reside” is from *baitu* “home, house, dwelling”<sup>169</sup>, (Akk. *bītu* “house”) or its derivative *bāta* “to spent the night” (Akk. *biādu* “to lodge, spent the night” (AG, 70) = CA CII *baiyata* “to lodge, make spend the night”, BAram. *byt* “to spent the night”: *byt* “house” (Rosenthal, 1963: 79), Tham. *bt* id. (Branden, 1950: 512).

**2.12.22** CA *wazafa* “to hurry, hasten”, a similar meaning is expressed by *ʾazafa* (MA, 25), in OYem. *wazafa* “to urge forward, hasten” (LA, r. *wzf*). Besides, CA *wazīfu* “haste, hurry” = *zafīfu* id.: *zaffa* “to harry, hasten; said of wind, “to blow” also “to move, stir, shake”; *zafzafa*, said of ostrich, “to flap the wings, spread the wings” and perh. “make oneself fall fast to the ground” = Ge. *ʾanzafzafa* “se déployer (ailes, branches), s’agiter (mains)”, Tna. *zāfzāf bālā* “secouer, agiter”, Amh. *ʾānzfāzzāfā* “agiter, batter des ailes”, also Ge. *zaffa*, *zafafa* “tomber à plat, s’affaler”, Tna. *zāf bālā* “tomber par terre”(DRS VIII, 778, 779), etc. In CA *zafā* also expresses “to blow (wind), make the dust move and rise, *as waves do with a ship*” also “to raise, lift up; flap the wings (ostrich)”; *zafyānu* “fast, speedy”.

Shifting the order of radicals [*wzf*] and [*zff*] does not make any important change of meaning: cf. CA *wafazu* “hurry; hastiness”; CX *ʾistawfaza* “prepare oneself to jump”; *wafaza-tu* expresses, according to Layth (in LA, r. *wfz*) “standing on the feet, but not in upright position, so as to prepare oneself to jump”. All are from *\*faz-* “to jump”, and from this biliteral a number of triliterals have been formed by the addition of grammatical prefixes like *ʾfz*, orig. CIV of [*faz*] (see §2.3.16 above) and *nfz* (see §2.11.74 above). Others, like *ḳafaza* ~ *ḡafaza* “to jump” (Syr. *ḳwz*, Aram. *ḳpz*, BHeb. *ḳps*: cf. Moscati, 1969: §8.8) will be studied in depth in §2.17.83 below. The biliteral *\*paz-* may be present in the compound trilateral [*ḥfz*]: see §2.17.70 below.

To my understanding, both [*zf*] and [*fz*] are definitely from an earlier [*ḏaf*] (see §3.4.25 above), and that the phoneme *\*ḏ-* had been split into *\*d-* and *\*z-*: cf. *ḏaffa* “to hasten, hurry”; *ḏaffīfu* “quick, rapid”, and with the same /w-/ becoming part of the root: *ta-waḏḏufu* “rapidity”.

**3.12.23** BHeb. *yāḥam* “to be or become warm; be in heat, be in rut”, also “to conceive (of a woman)”, CA *waḥuma* “be warm, be in heat, be in rut” (OT, 395); *waḥima-t*, CV *tawaḥḥama-t*, said only of a *pregnant woman*, “to long, crave for”; n. *wiḥāmu* as in the

<sup>169</sup> CA: (a) *wataba*, cited by Cohen (DRS VII, 649), “rester fixé a une place sans bouger” and (b) *wattāb* “contraction, crispation des nerfs”, may give the impression that they are from [*wbt*] by metathesis. The first word is *dialectal*, while the second is obviously from *waṯṯābu* id., SL *waṯṯīb* id. (by *Imalah*, i.e. *ā > ī*), from *waṯaba* “to jump, rise”.

PIP of Labid:

«...ḳad rābahu 'iṣyānīhā wa wiḥāmuhā» (DL, p. 169: 1).

To this proot belongs Ug. ḥmḥm-t “pregnancy” (UG, 535). The real CA has a suffix -l: ḥamlu id.; ḥāmilu “pregnant”.

It is important to note that [wḥm] is closely associated with ḥamala-t “be pregnant”, which is from “to carry”, or ḥabila-t “be pregnant” to the extent that [wḥm] presupposes the existence of ‘pregnancy’.

**2.12.24** CA waduḥa “become clear, evident, or visible”; waddaḥa “to show, make clear, shed light on”; waddāḥu “shining, luminous”; wadḥu “light” < BHeb. ṣāḥaḥ “be bright, sunny”; ṣaḥ “dazzling white, bright” also “sunny, clear, plain of words”, BAram. ṣḥḥ “make shine, polish”, Syr. ṣḥḥ “to shine” (OT, 890), CA ḏaḥḥā “make clear, bring to light”, ḏiḥḥu “the sun, sunshine”, ḏuḥā “sunshine, daylight” (see §2.13.24, esp. n. 5d-5g below).

**2.12.25** CA wa'ku “intense heat with abated wind” < 'akku “intense heat with abated wind” ~ 'akku id., with 'akka-tu “chaleur, mauvais tempérament”, Akk. ekū, ikū “manquer d'nécessaire”; 'akt “manque, état de misère”, Syr. 'akkātā “colère”, Ge. 'əkay “mauvais tempérament”, 'əkuy “mauvais”, Te. 'aka “être mauvais” (DRS I, 18), Chad.: Diri akuwa, Miya ākwe, Jmb akwa, Ngz aka “fire”, Mig okko, Jegu 'ook “fire”, Sok oko id., Log kku “hot” (HSED, 237), Cush. 'aakw- “fire; to burn” (RPAA, n. 717) as in Arb. eek, eg, Mogogodo iku “feu”, Bil. wāg “lumière du feu”, Berb. uku “allumer”, Kab. ekwu “brûler, être ardent”; kkaw “être sec”, etc. (DRS VI, 537). For Akk.: cf. CA 'akkatu “calamity, hardship” see below.

a) To the proot under discussion certainly belong Ge. wākaya “briller, étinceler, resplendir”, Amh. waka “lumière”, Akk. akukūtu “brandon, tison, rougeoiement du ciel”, SA 'ughe (?) “devenir rougeâtre”. On the etymology of the Akk. word, Cohen (DRS VI, 537) *wrongly* ascribes it to borrowing from ‘an unknown source’ and considers its similarity to SA and Eth. words as a matter of chance.

b) In CA 'akka-tu “intense heat” above = 'aḡḡa-tu id. In Egyp., too, the difference in phonetic composition between /k/ and /g/ is neutralized, hence wg “be burned, to burn”,

c) CA ta-wa'aka “be indisposed in health, esp. *due to fever or exhaustion*”; wa'aka ~ ma'aka “to wallow in dust (as animals do)”.

**2.12.26** CA waḳala “to ascend, go up a mountain”, perh. orig. “mountain” since waḳlu coll. “stone”, Te. wāḳḳālā “être haut, plein”; wāḳāla “chanter fort, soulever” (DRS VII, 606): PHS stem [ḳal-] “summit, anything looks high” as in CA ḳalla “to rise”; ḳulla-tu fem. “top, summit of a mountain”, Berb.: Kab. aḳərru “tête”, So. aḳəllal “tête, cruche”, Cush.: Ag., Bil. aḡūr “tête”, Sa., Af. hangal id. (VPHS, 125-126).

It is important to note that [ḳmm] and [ḳnn] express a similar meaning as in CA ḳimma-tu fem. “summit, top”, Sab. ḳmm “summit” (SD, 105), CA ḳunna-tu fem. “top, summit (of anything), small mountain”; CVIII 'iḳtanna “to stand (erect)”: comp. Cush.: Bad. ḳinō, ḳinē “head”, PChad. \*k-n- “head” (Müller, 1975: 64, n. 7). With prefixed w-: CA waḳana = waḳala above.

The stem has already been seen with caus. /š-/ in §2.2.25 above.

**2.12.27** CA ri'a-tu "guidance, turning away from evil", is from "desisting from evil or harming deeds" (MA, 417) > wari'a "to prevent, stop, desist from"; wara'u "coward, fearful", BHeb. yārē' "be afraid, in awe, to revere", OffAram. yr' "to harm", Jp. yr' "to despair", Sab hwr', caus. "to intimidate, prevent", Eth.: Te. wāra "to threaten, fight": PHS stem [ra'-] "tremble, frighten, thunder", seen in all Semitic trilaterals beginning with [ra'-]<sup>170</sup>. The proot is also seen with infixed -w- as in CA [r. rw'] as in rā'a, rauwa'a "to inspire with awe, frighten".

<sup>170</sup> [r'm]: in Akk. "to thunder", BHeb. "to be moved, agitated, to thunder"; ra'mā "a trembling, quivering", CA "to waste away", Aram., Mand. "to thunder", BAram. "to roar", Syr. "to roar, clamor, cry aloud"; [r'š]: in BHeb. "to shake, tremble, be agitated", CA "to tremble, quiver", Aram. "to quiver, shake"; [r']: in BHeb. "to shake, tremble", BAram. "to crush, break", CA "be agitated, disturbed (water)"; [r'l]: in Aram., Syr. "to quiver", CA "to thrust or stab quickly", BHeb., BAram. "to tremble"; [r'd]: in BHeb. "to tremble, quiver", CA "to thunder, tremble, shake", Aram. "to tremble", Ge. "to tremble", Har. "to thunder", Tne., Te., Amh. "to tremble"; [r']: in BHeb. "to break", CA "to shake and move, be agitated, twisted". In addition, CA also has [r'd] "to break", [r'd] "to shake from anger", and [r'ġ] "to trouble, disturb", [r'b] "to frighten", etc.

There is still, however, a Semitic trilateral [r'y] which has nothing to do with the general concept expressed by its supposed kindreds above. Derivatives of this root have been preserved, though with different proportions, in all Hamito-Semitic languages. Some of them are: Phoen., OffAram., Palm. r'y "to feed, to graze; shepherd", Akk. ri-i-tu ~ rītu "pasture", OAram. r'y id. (NWSI II, 1080), Assy. rē'u "to pasture, to rule" also "shepherd"; rē'ūtu "shepherding, rule", BHeb. rā'ā "to pasture, to rule" (King, 1898: 383) = CA rā'a "to pasture, to rule" also "to watch, guard, oversee"; rā'ī "shepherd, ruler, overseer, eye of the people or tribe on the enemy", Sab. [r'y] "to pasture, protect in a lawsuit; guidance", etc. see §2.8.11 below.

For what concerns the semantic change that [r'-] has undergone, two obvious facts must be taken into consideration:

a) There is no doubt that \*r'- once expressed "frighten" as will be demonstrated below, but that, due to the frequent interchange of /'/' and /'/', a confusion of [r'-] "to see, watch" and [r'-] "to frighten" has taken place and caused [r'-] to express significations originally lying outside the spheres of its specialization. This confusion is evident in CA CIV 'ar'ā "to watch and wait for" as in the PIP of Khansa:

«'ar'ā ('a)n nuġūma wa mā kullifta ri'y-ata-hā...»

b) My statement that [r'] does not express *to frighten*, etc. above, is only half-correct, since we can express this idea by prefixing or infixing /w/, hence Semitic [rw'] and [wr'] (see §2.12.27 above). Another kindred trilateral is [hr'] as in CIV pass. 'uhri'a "be shaken due to fear, be frightened" whose /h-/ is rightly considered a prefix by Bin Faris (ML VI, 47).

c) Notion of 'watch, guard' as well as 'show, i.e. cause to see' is supposed to be expressed by CIV \*'ar'a. For ease of pronunciation, \*'ar'a > 'ar'a *watch, guard*, etc. above, and CI 'arā has come to express both "see", as in 'arā-hu "I see him", and "show" as in 'arā-hu X (X = object of verb) "I showed him X".

Another trilateral has undergone a similar change is [r'm] above, also expresses "to watch", esp. "watch the sunset".

**2.12.28** Min. wḵ' "to have sexual relations", Meh. šə-wḵ'ā "to fall", hə-wḵ'a "to lie down", Jip. šə-bḵa' "to fall" (DRS VII: 607f), CA waḵa'a "to fall (down)", said of animal "to kneel down", CIII wāḵa'a "to have sexual intercourse" (from notion 'lie down'); waḵ'a-tu "sleeping at the end of the night". The stem ḵa' is also seen in §§2.4.7; 3.4.8 & 2.7.7 above.

**2.12.29** OffAram. yšb "valid" (NWSI I, 465), BAram. yšb "make certain, be sure, certain", BHeb. yšb "to speak the truth; certainly"; *Hithp.* hityaššēb "to hold one's ground, take a stand, stand firm", CA wašaba "be firm, persist" (Ryder, 1974: 137; OT, 416) < CA šā'ibu "correct, right, advisable"; šawābu "reason, consciousness, rectitude"; šāba, CIV 'ašāba "be correct, right, to hit the point or the mark".

A glance at other derivatives of BHeb. [yšb] such as "to set, put, to place; to take a stand, to stand, to stand forth, to stand firm", reveals clearly that the CA cognate is [nšb], i.e. with prefixed /n-/, as in našaba = "to set (up), place, put (up) anything (like ḡarsa- "a plant", šarak- "a trap", haima-"tent", etc. + "to raise"); 'intašaba "to stand up, stand erect". BHeb. [yšb] also expresses the idea of 'rising up' + prep. "(over) against" = CA nāšaba "to oppose, to stand against, i.e. rise up against" (see §2.11.42 above).

**2.12.30** CA wafada "to come to (usu. from a distant place)", hence wafdu, coll., "envoy"; muwfadu or mūfadu "envoy, messenger", pl. wufūdu. This is not a wrong cognate of Egyp. ywpwtí pl. id., sg., ypwty (EHD I, 33; EG, 560). Gardiner (ibid.) derives Egyp. *ipt* "mission, message"; ypwty "messenger" from wpy "to open, to judge, to divide". Budge (EHD I, 160) assigns to the verb the meaning "to open up, i.e. to inquire into a matter, to judge, to decree". This latter signification is expressed by CA CIV 'awfā [r. wfy] أشرف و اطلع "to overlook (from a high place) with the purpose of becoming acquainted with, of becoming aware of". The trilateral [wfd] expresses a similar meaning, hence 'awfā ~ 'awfada plus prep. 'alā "on" = أشرف (ML VI, 129): PHS proot \*pa'- "opening", with w-: Egyp. wp "door"; wpy "to open", Chad.: Dwot wup "to open" (HSED, n. 2553). It should be made clear that CA wāfā [wfy] signifies "come to or go to (for the purpose of meeting, seeing, etc. s.o.)": see §2.17.31 below.

**2.12.31** Sab. wfd "to cultivate; plant" (SD, 157) is perh. from a stem \*pad-, orig. meant "foot, side" (§2.3.44 above & §2.17.38 below): CA faddādu "farmer, a yoke of oxen" also "flat, or even, land" as in Poet. (Hassān Bin Thābit):

«...mawāridu mā'in multaḵāhā bi-*fadfadi*» (JAA, p. 494, L. 8).

With n-ext.: faddānu "a measure of land", orig. based on 'foot' as a *measure* also "farm-land, a yoke of oxen as used for plowing", OffAram. pdn "plough", Syr., BAram. pdn id. (OT, 835), Assyr. padānu "path, way" (King, 1898: 357).

**2.12.32** Sab. wḵl "be worried, anxious about s.t" (SD, 161), Jib. ebḵel "provoquer une dispute" (DRS VII, 606) = CA ḵaliḵa "be worried, anxious about s.t.": ḵalḵala "be shaken and disturbed"; ḵalḵala-tu "excessive agitation and disturbance", BHeb. ḵilḵal "to shake, move quickly to and fro", in Eth. "be moved, be shaken", Mand. ḵrḵl "to reverse" (OT, 928): PHS stem \*ḵal-, whose orig. meaning may be "becoming less or

little” (cf. Akk. *ḫallilu* “small”, CA *ḫalīlu* “little; small”) as in CA CIV *ʾaḫalla* “become poor”, Akk. *ḫalḫalatu* “hunger”, Talm. *ḫlḫl* “starvation” (MD, 416).

**2.12.33** CA *wallaʾa* “to kindle a fire, light”, *ta-wlīʾu* “(rectangular) colored spot in an animal’s skin different from its skin color”; adj. *ma-wallaʾu*. If the colored spot is not rectangular, it will be called *ta-lmīʾu*. It appears evident that [lmʾ] “to flash, glitter, etc.” is also based on \*laʾ-, OffAram. [twlʾ] “red/purple color” as in *gldy twlʾ* “two red/purple-colored skins” (NWSI I, 1206), Tna. *wälläʾa* “to kindle, light”, Te. *wälläʾa* “to kindle” (DRS, VII, 533), Eyp. lʾi “light, fire, flame” (EHD I, 419), perh. Chad.: Dafo-Butura leʾ “begin, of the day”, Cush.: Saho, Afar *läläʾ* “day”, Araqw loʾa “sun, God”, Alagwa *leleʾa* “sun”, Burunge *letu id.* (HSED, n. 1660).

Radicals /-ʾ/ of the stem interchanges position with /ʾ/, hence [laʾ-] “to gleam, glitter, beam” as in CA *laʾlaʾa* = *laʾlaʾa id.* One can shift the order of radicals [ʾal] without any significant change of meaning as in CA *ʾalla* = “to flash, glitter, scintillate”, Tna. *ʾalala* “rôtir”, Berb.: To. *ëiləl* “mirage”; m-lw “miroiter, scintiller”, Cush.: Ag., Bil. *alal* (à côté de *ʾalal*) “rôtir”, Som. *olol* “étincelle, flamme” (VPHS, 82, n. 31).

**2.12.34** BHeb. *yāmaš* “to feel, to touch” (OT, 404), CA *wamasa*, said of any two things/objects, “to rub one object against another”, the underlying meaning is “be in very close contact/touch”, and is common as a noun. In MSA and dialects the trilateral has been preserved in *mūmisu* (or *muwmisu*) “prostitute”, orig. “one who touches”, which is a natural development of “be in direct touch (with anyone)” as in the following line of Poet.:

«...wa ḫad ḡarrada<sup>171</sup> (ʾa)l ʾaktāfa *wamsu* (ʾa)l ḫawāriki», lit. *flesh of the shoulders has been scraped off by the friction of their (two) upper bones.*

PHS stem [maš] is also seen in CA *mašūšu* “a towel used for drying or wiping the hand”; *mašša* “to wipe or clean the hand” (MA, 376), i.e. *touch with the hand*, as in the PIP of Imriʾ Al Qais:

«*namuššu* biʾaʾrāfi (ʾa)l ḡiyādi ʾakuffunā...» (DI, p. 47, L. 3).

The radicals /-š & -s/ are definitely from an earlier /θ/, and the word *namuššu* (in the line of poetry) is said to be *namaθθu* (see §2.17.32 below).

**2.12.35** CA [wḡz] *waḡaza*, CIV *ʾauḡaza* “to cut short, summarize”, Ge. *gəzat* “excommunication”, Tna. *wägäzä* “to excommunicate”, Amh. *awägäzä*, Gour. *awäggäzä id.* (DRS VI, 492): see §2.1.8.1 above.

**2.12.36** Ug. *yšm* “to curse”, Sab. *wšm* “disgrace, dishonor” (DRS VII, 593; SD, 164), CA *wašama* “to stigmatize; disgrace, dishonor; stigma, disgrace”; *wašma-tu* “indecent language, mark of dishonor”; *wašmu* “illness” also “languor”. This particular trilateral, together with [wsm], is discussed at length in §2.2.48, esp. n. 2h above.

**2.12.37** Ug. *yθn* “old”, BHeb. *yāšon id.* (Shehadeh, 1968: 49), CA *wāθinu* “lasting,

<sup>171</sup> Pun m-grd “scraper, scratcher” (NWSI II, 594) = SL *ma-žrūd id.*

continuous, and persistent”; CX ’istawθna, said of bees, “become two groups: young and old”, said of camels “their kids grow up with them”, i.e. *young and old camels grow up together* (LA, r. wθn).

a) In Sab. wθn expresses “stele, boundary stone”; myθn “monument” (SD, 166) = CA waθanu “an idol”. All are from PHS \*θin- “be old” as in BHeb. [wšn]: *Niph. nōšan* “be dry”, spoken of old grain of *a former year*, opposed to new or of this year, Lev. 26, 10. (OT, 434) = CA θinnu “dry (plants), broken fragments of dry plants” as in Poet.:

«faḏalalna yahbiṭna hašīma (’a)θ θinni

ba’da ’amīmi (’a)r raudati (’a)l muṣinni»(ML I, 370).

Egyp. θny “be old, old age, aged” (EHD II, 856) ~ tny id. (EHD II, 838): see §2.3.50 above.

**2.12.38** BHeb. yešēḥ “emptiness, hunger” is connected by Gesenius (OT, 433) with CA waḥša-tu “desolation”, i.e. *emptiness*, as in makānun (= place); mūḥišu, i.e. *no one in it*; CX ’istawḥaša “to feel lonely and afraid”, i.e. *no one around*; CIV ’awḥaša, said of a place, “be desolate”, i.e. *empty of people*, etc., SA: Meh. šəwḥaws “être seul et avoir peur”, Jib. šəbḥeš “être seul et malheureux”, etc. (DRS VI, 523).

a) The notion of “hunger” is expressed in this fixed expression «bāta (= he stayed or spent the night) ’al (= the) waḥšu (= hungry)», *he spent the night hungry* (MA, 416). To my understanding, CA [wḥš] centers round the notion of ‘feeling’ or *ḥissu*. It is to be noted that the sequence \*wḥs is impermissible. Ašma’i (MA, 31) states that *waḥšiy* is the antonym of *’insiy* “right hand, right side” also “the side that faces you or is before you”. This may be due to the fact that *’ins*, whose basic meaning is ‘mankind’ (opposite of both *ḡinniy* “jinn” and *waḥšiy* “wild animal”), derives into “sociability, pleasure, i.e. *good omen*”, hence “the right (hand)”, whereas the signification of *waḥšiy* “bad omen”, hence *the left*. All such significations of [’ns] and [wḥš] are idioms far removed from the basic meanings of the two trilaterals.

b) The exact CA cognate is šihḥu “running out”; šaḥḥ “scanty, insufficient”.

**2.12.39** Akk. (w)akāmu(m) “être trouble, brumeux”, CA wakima “être triste, affligé” (DRS VI, 549). In CA [wkm] and [wḵm] seem to be variants of one root: wakama ~ waḵama “make sad”; ma-wkūmu or ma-wḵūmu “very sad”; wukima- or wuḵima pass., said of the earth, lit. “be trodden upon and (its plants) eaten up” (LA), Sab. wḵm “render submissive” (SD, 161). It should be noted that CA waḵama also signifies “to humiliate and subdue, render submissive, suppress, drive back” and this latter meaning is most commonly expressed by ḵama’a (LA): cf. Sab. ḵm’ “to overthrow s.o/s.t” (SD, 105): PHS stem [ḵam], also seen with prefixed caus. /š-/ in §2.2.23 above.

**2.12.40** BHeb. yeḵeb “wine-vat, receptacle into which the must or new wine flowed from the press” and, according to Gesenius (OT, 419), «*It was often excavated in the earth or even in the rock*», NHeb. yāḵab, yiḵḵēb “to hollow out”, CA waḵbu “a hollow in the rock in which water collects (like a well), anything hollowed, window”; waḵbu expresses, according to Farāḥīdi (Al ’ayn V, 228), “anything hollowed; hole, pit” as in Poet.:

«fī *waḳbi* ḥauṣā'a kawaḳbi (ʾa)l mudhani».

Hence, 'iḳābu “entering s.th. into a hole or pit”; waḳaba “to enter into” (ṢHH I, 234) as in the Koran (113: 3): (ومن شر غاسق إذا وقب), also “to bore”; mīḳābu strangely denotes “one who drinks wine to excess”; 'awḳābu “house furniture”, from ḳabwu below (LA), Phoen. yḳb “to enter” (NWSI I, 466), SA: Meh. wḳb “to enter” (DRS VII, 601), etc.

All words above have developed from a stem \*ḳab- as in BHeb. ḳab “a hollow or concave vessel”; ḳābab “make convex or concave”; ḳubbā “a tent, high and round like a dome, a vaulted pleasure-tent”, BAram. ḳbb “to hollow out, to arch, to vault” (OT, 908), Akk. ḳabū-tu “goblet”, CA ḳabba, ḳabbaba id.; ḳubba-tu “dome, vault” also ḳabā [ḳbw] “to arch, bend, curve”; ḳabwu “vault, a room or cellar with arched walls and ceiling”, Chad.: Tera kəba, Gude kuva “hut” (HSED, n. 1599).

a) Semitic [nḳb] (see §2.8.27, n. 2 b above) is from \*n- + \*-ḳab-, and \*-ḳab- itself is not a proot, but rather a compound of \*ḳw- “to hollow out, make convex or concave, curve” and \*-b-. When a thing or object is hollowed out, it is said to ‘be empty’, hence the PIP Nabiyah says:

«yā dāra maiyata bi(ʾa)l 'alyā'i wa (ʾa)s sanadi  
'aḳwat wa ṭāla 'alaihā sālfu' (a)l 'abadi»

The complete assimilation of \*-w- to \*-b has given rise to the trilateral [ḳbb] above. The proot \*ḳw- is seen in CA ḳwb as in ḳub-tu “I dig out, scoop (the ground) by making concave” as in the PIP of Thu Rummah:

«bihi 'araṣāti (ʾa)l ḥayyi *ḳauwab*-na matnahu...» (Al 'Ayn V, 227).

A derivative of this trilateral is ḳūba-tu “egg”, from its shape, Egyp. ḳ'b “vessel, pot”. The proot is seen without \*/-b/ in [nḳ] “cave, rock cleft” (see NWSI II, 756). From the proot \*ḳw- also developed Phoen. nḳ', BHeb. nḳ'ḳ “rock cleft” (PG, 125), etc.

b) Besides \*-b, another radical \*/-r/ can be suffixed to the proot \*ḳw- as in CA ḳauwara, said of the eye, “to scoop out”, said of the hide, etc. “make a round hole in the middle” (in Egyp. “middle” is expressed by means of \*-b- not \*-r-, hence ḳ'b id.: see n. e below); muḳauwaru “hollowed out, scooped, concave”, BHeb. ḳwr “to dig for water”, hence Semitic \*nḳr in §2.8.27, n. 4 above, Egyp. ḳ'wr, ḳ'r “boat, barge”, ḳ'r “hole, hollow”, ḳ'rr “cellar, chamber” (EHD I, 762-763), etc.

c) Semitic \*nḳp (§2.8.27, n. 5 above): BHeb. \*ḳwp “to move in a circle”, hence tḳūpā “circuit”, CA ḳūfu “the exterior round part of the ear” also “the whole of the neck”, so-called from its round shape; ḳāfu “mountain surrounding the (ends of) world”, etc. seemingly from notion “circular or round sides”: Berb. eḳəf “kopf”, Tchad. kofo “hinterkopf, gehirn” (Müller, 1975: 64, n. 8), CA ḳafā “back of the head”, Har. ḳafāt “forehead”, S. W. Z. ḳāfāt (HED, 122). Also belong here Har. ḳāfāfa “to cut the top or edge and make a hole”, Tna., Amh., Gur. ḳāf(f)āfā (HED, 122).

d) To PHS \*ḳw- belong, among many others, Egyp. ḳ'ḳ' “boat, barge”, from its concave shape, JAram. ḳwḳ(ʾ) “ossuary” (NWSI II, 1004), Som. ḳawyo “cave”, Ga. gaa “hole”.

e) The interchange of /-w-/ and /-r-/ was one of the characteristic features of PSem. The only Semitic language to have often preserved both forms, the earlier [i.e. /-w-/] and the later [i.e. /-r-/], is CA. For example, PSem. [ḳrb] expresses “to draw near, be near, approach” as in Assy. ḳirēbu, ḳarābu, BHeb. ḳarab id. (King, 1898: 382), OffAram.,



Nab., Palm., Hatra  $\text{ḳrb}$  id. (NWSI II, 1028-290). CA has both roots, the earlier  $[\text{ḳwb}]$  in  $\text{ḳāba}$  (i.e.  $\text{ḳawaba}$ ) id. and the later  $[\text{ḳrb}]$  in  $\text{ḳaruba}$ <sup>172</sup> id.

Other derivatives are Egyp.  $\text{ḳ}^{\text{'}}\text{b}$  “the middle of anything” = Assy.  $\text{ḳirib}$  “midst; bowels; within” (King *ibid*), Moab., EHeb.  $\text{ḳereb}$  “midst, inside” (NWSI *ibid.*), BHeb.  $\text{ḳereb}$  “the midst, middle” (OT, 941), CA  $\text{ḳurbu}$  “waist, flank”, i.e. *middle*, also “near(ness)”. Egyp.  $m\text{ḳ}^{\text{'}}\text{b}$  “within” = CA  $bi\text{ḳurb}$  “near”, BHeb.  $bəḳereb$  “in the midst of, within”. Besides, Egyp. has  $\text{ḳb}$  “bowels” also “innermost part” (EHD I, 767),  $\text{ḳ}^{\text{'}}\text{b}$ ,  $\text{ḳb}$  “intestines” (EHD II, 763, 767) = CA  $\text{ḳabbu}$  “stomach of a horse”;  $\text{ḳabḳabu}$  “stomach” from the notion “middle, innermost” as in  $\text{ḳabbu}$  “a hole in the middle of a pulley, wooden bar in the middle of a pulley, what is between the two hips”, Chad.: Sura  $\text{ḳəpīt}$  “stomach” (Müller, 1975: 68, n. 56), Te.  $\text{ḳabat}$ , Amh.  $\text{ḳafat}$  “estomac de ruminant”, Cush.: Ag., Bil.  $\text{ḳabat}$  id., etc. (VPHS, 125, n. 230).

f) The complete assimilation of  $*\text{-w-}$  to the following  $*\text{-r-}$  in  $[\text{ḳwr}]$  has given rise, as one should expect (see  $\text{ḳbb}$  in (1) above for a similar process), to a new trilateral  $[\text{ḳrr}]$ , expressing the same notion, and to which available grammatical prefixes, infixes, and suffixes may be added. Hence, we have Egyp.  $\text{ḳr-t}$  “hole, cave, circle”, CA  $\text{ḳarḳaru}$  “depressed ground”;  $\text{ḳarāru}$  “round bottom of a depressed ground”. Like Egyp.  $\text{ḳ}^{\text{'}}\text{ḳ}$  above, CA  $\text{ḳurḳuru}$  “a ship”. The presence of Egyp.-CA  $[\text{ḳur-}]$  “frog” (also in other HS languages: cf. Cohen, 1969: 126) makes it inevitable that  $*\text{ḳr}$  is also bound to denote “a hole in the ground collecting water or a spring of water”, hence Ug.  $\text{ḳr}$  “well” (UG, 537), CA  $\text{ḳarra}$  “to pour out (water)”; CVIII “to wash oneself”,  $\text{ḳarwu}$  signifies, according to one account, “a long basin resembling a river (little river?, little well?)” and according to another lit. “a large basin pouring into a neighboring rectangular basin” (Al ‘Ayn, V, 203; LA), Sab.  $\text{ḳrw}$  “channel opening into a basin” (SD, 107).

g) Changing the order of radicals  $[\text{ḳrw}]$  gives rise to  $\text{waḳra-tu}$  “hollow, hole” =  $\text{waktat-u}$  (Al ‘ayn V, 207) = Ge.  $\text{wāḳārā}$  “to engrave”, Tna.  $\text{wāḳārā}$ , Te.  $\text{wāḳḳārā}$  id., Har.  $\text{waḳārā}$  “to engrave, punch holes in the millstone to roughen it”, SE.  $\text{wḳr}$  “to engrave” (HED, 160). By prefixing  $n\text{-}$  to  $[\text{ḳr}]$ , we get the Semitic trilateral  $[\text{nḳr}]$  as in CA  $\text{naḳara}$  “to to engrave, inscribe (esp. *on stone*), make a hole in (esp. *in stone*), dig into”, etc.

h) There are, of course, other trilaterals derived from  $*\text{ḳw-}$ , one of which is seen in CA  $\text{ḳawisa}$  “be curved, bent, as a bow”;  $\text{ḳawsu}$  “arch, bow” and, in combination with  $\text{ḳuzaḥ}$ , “rainbow”, a phrase which has been much more common than arch. *nud’a-tu* id. throughout the history<sup>173</sup>, BHeb.  $\text{ḳešet}$  [r.  $\text{ḳwš}$ ] “bow”;  $\text{ḳūšā-yāhū}$  “bow of Jehovah”, i.e. *rainbow* (OT, 923), Ug.  $\text{ḳšt}$  “bow”, OAram., OffAram., Samal, Pun  $\text{ḳšt}$  “arch, bow”, etc. see §2.9.20 above.

### Comments

I have noted that trilaterals based on  $*\text{gw-}$  (and to some extent on  $*\text{kw-}$ ) express the same deep meaning as those based on  $*\text{ḳw-}$ . The following illustrations are confined to

<sup>172</sup> It is most amazing to find that CA  $[\text{ḳrf}]$ , with a voiceless  $/-f/$ , also expresses “draw near” (MA, 329).

<sup>173</sup> Old Arab scholars tried unsuccessfully to proscribe  $\text{ḳawsu ḳuzaḥ}$  ( $\text{ḳuzaḥ}$  = Satan) and prescribe  $\text{ḳawsu } 'Allāh$  (= God).

some trilaterals based on \*gw-.

1) CA ḡāba “to hollow, hew out” as in the Koran: (وثمود الذين جابوا الصخر بالواد) , And (the tribe of) *Thamūd who hewed out the rocks in the valley* [and used them as homes] (89: 9) also “to bore through, dig out”; gub-tu = ḡub-tu = “make a hole or a pocket in”; ḡawba-tu “empty space between houses” also “depressed ground, low lying land, hole”, Tham. gwb “puits, fosse” (Branden, 1950: 512), BHeb. gwb “to dig a well”; gēb “well, cistern” (Semitic gbb id. below), with ygb “to plough, to cleave the ground with a plough” (OT, 182, 373): PHS proot [gaw] or [guw] as in BAram. gw “the middle, midst”, in CA and Syr. “the inside of a house, within”, hence BHeb. גָּבַח “in the midst of” (OT, 182), Phoen. gw, OAram., OffAram., Hatra, Palm., JAram. gw “interior”, etc. (NWSI I, 215-216; DRS II, 106).

Here belong with various extensions: Har. gutti “middle, center”, Ed., Z., En. gət “middle”, S., W. gut, E., M., Ms., Go. gəbət, Gt. gəbet, A. gəfit id., Te. məgəb id., Har. gutti “middle”, Ed., Z., En. gət, S., W., gut, E., M. gəbət, Gt., gəbt, A. gəfit (HED, 76): CA mū-ḡauwabu “anything hollowed in the middle”; ḡi(y)b- (in *Hadith* attributed to Abu Bakr, the first Islamic Caliph) “middle” (LA). For ‘*middle*’, see n. e above.

2) In addition, CA ḡauwu “large valley, low lying land” = BHeb. gy’ “valley”, SAR gw’ “pénéttrer dans les profondeurs de la terre” (DRS II, 106) and CA ḡiṡā’u “a dish, vessel” = Eyp. gw “sack, bag, basket”, gw’t “box” (EHD II, 805), later gt id., Chad.: Banana gwəta “calabash” (HSED, n. 989); with b-ext.: CA ḡawbu “bucket, pail”, and with \*-w- being assimilated to the following \*-b (see below): ḡubāḡibu “belly” used as a sack or bag to store food, esp. *meat*. It is only now, and for the first time, I understand why CA trilateral [wḡr] above has ḡira-tu expressing “a sheep’s belly”.

3) The basic meaning of Eyp. \*gW- is “be sick, to suffer” as in g(’), g’, g’w, etc. “to suffer, to lack air, be choked, suffocated, blocked, to suffer want, etc.” (EHD II, 800) ~ gw “be choked, blockaded” ~ gw’ “to blockade, shut in; tightness or twisting in the chest, disease” (EHD II, 805), etc. = CA ḡawā “disease in the chest, heart disease, disease inside the body”; ’iḡtawā “be sick, be sick of (a place)”, to suffer *from grief*, *from love*, *disease*”, etc.

4) In all Semitic languages the proot \*gw- also express “people, community” (= CA ḡw-m people) as in Akk. ga’, gaw- “people”, SAR. gaw, Heb. gōy id., Sab. gw-m “community group” (SD, 51), Chad.: Sura Ang go “man”, Krk ḡgā, Ngm ḡgō id., Bid gee- masc. “friend”; gaa- fem. (HSED, n. 906, 907).

5) The same proot also express “parts inside the body”, from \*guw- “inside, interior” above, as in BHeb. gewīyāh “entrails, body”, Syr. gawwā, Mand. giwta “intestines”, Soq. gehe “chest”, Amh. guya “chest, breast”, Chad.: Housa ḡawā “corpse”, Sokoro goy id. etc.

One should also expect that the signification of *gaw* should also extend to what is between *earth* and *sky*, hence in CA ‘*atmosphere, space*’, etc.

6) As /-b/ can be suffixed to /gw-/, /r-/, too, can be suffixed to it as in Heb. gōr “cavity”, MSA ḡūra-tu “hole, cavity; large pit, or well, dug in the ground for waste matter” and as in CA, “low-lying land (usu. a fertile land), depressed ground”, CA ḡawwāru = ’akkāru (§3.3.30 above), *one who digs a hole in the ground*.

From the notion ‘*hole*’ have developed Har. ḡār “house, room”, W. gar “house”, S., Z.

gār id. (HED, 73-74), Cush.: Mao. gera, Moča. kăro "house", Som. guri, guuri "house", Oromo gooroo "wall", Bambala gore, Darasa goo're "shed", Chad.: Mubi gir id. (Müller, 1975: 65, n. 19; HSED, n. 956, 984), Housa gure "place", Mbara guru "enclosure", Berb.: Nefusa a-grur "enclosure, wall", Ahagar a-gror "enclosure", Kabyl agrur id. CA ġawāru having to do with dār = house, perh. *a structure connected to the house and courtyard*; ġāru "neighbor" also "stranger", BHeb. gūr "to sojourn, to dwell for a time" with gēr "stranger" (OT, 185), Ug. gr, Phoen. \*gr, SA gr "étranger", etc. (DRS II, 109). In CA ġār- also "wife; husband", Phoen. gr "juene garçon", Moab. grn masc. pl., grt fem. pl. id., etc. (DRS II, 109): see n. 4 above, Amh., Gaf. goḡo "hut", Cush.: Ga., Som., Saho, Tem., Al. \*goḡo id. (HED, 70).

6a) Here also belongs Cush. gir- "to exist, to be": cf. Som., Oromo, Rendille gir- id. = Sem. gwr "to dwell" above.

7) The same sort of assimilation, whereby [ḵwb] → [ḵbb] and [ḵwr] → [ḵrr] above, is also noted in [gwb] → [gbb] and in [gwr] → [grr].

7a) Examples of [gwb] → [gbb] are Akk., CA gubbu "well, cistern", Mand. guba "ditch, pit, cistern, pool" (MD, 82), BHeb. gābab "be curved, hollow" also "be gibbous, convex", in the manner of an arch, vault; hence gab, "the back", i.e. *something gibbous*. BHeb. gab also denotes "the boss of a shield or buckler", i.e. *the exterior convex part* (= CA ġawbu "shield"), "a vault" (= CA mu-ġabbabu "vaulted, arched"), "an eye-brow", i.e. *arch of the eye* (= CA ġubba-tu "bone of the eye-brow" also "middle"), and "the rim of a wheel, the circumference" (OT, 171-172), Ge., Te. gəb "pit, hole", Har. gāb "cave" (HED, 67).

7b) As we should expect, /-w-/ assimilates completely to the following /-r/ → [grr] as in CA ġarūru "deep well", Akk. garru "box" (CA ġarra-tu "jar"), Chad.: Gude, Nzangi gəra "pot" (HSED, n. 894).

8) CA ġawfu "the interior of the belly, bowels (of the earth, of the body)" also "low-lying land"; 'aḡwafu "hollow"; ġāfa "be hollow"; CII ġauwafa "to hollow out"; CVIII 'iḡtāfa "to penetrate into the interior of"; ġīfa-tu "dead body, corpse", BHeb. gūpā id. (OT, 108), Hatra gwph "corpse, dead body, person", OffAram. gp, gp', JAram. gwph (NWSI I, 231), Eth.: W. gōf, Z. gūf, S. gāfa "empty", perh. Har. ḵōf-be "in emptiness" (HED, 122), Chad.: Kilba guguwī "heart", Gude guguf-in "lungs", Fali Kiria gugufi "heart" (HSED, n., 909) = CA ġawfu, a general term for all *interior parts of the body*.

**2.12.41** Akk. wēšum, OAssyr. we'āšum "s'abandonner" (DRS VI, 483) = Egyp. w's "to be in a ruined state; weak, feeble", CA waisu, like wailu, waiḥu, etc., is a word signifying "woe, grief, sorrow, misery" as in wailu-ka, wai-ka "woe to you". The term waisu, however, is different from others in that it is said to someone you *pity for* and *treat with kindness*. The term may also signify "poverty" in the fixed expression «'us-hu 'aws-an». LA (r. wyḥ) quotes Azhari as saying:

«The three words have their origin in a word 'way' and /-ḥ/, /-s/, and /-l/ are extra letters (suffixes)».

CA wailummih "woe to his mother" is one of recognized compounds in the language and consists of wai "woe" + -l- (prep. 'to') + 'umm "mother" and /-h/ is used for exaggeration (LA). On the *analogy* of this compound, one may think of *waibu* (= wailu

in meaning) as being from wai- + 'abu "father" and *wailu* from wai- + 'al "family", etc. But *analogy* here could be misleading.

**2.12.42** Akk. wabr-, ubr- "étranger"; wabart-, ubart- "petite colonie faisant du commerce" *must be* from \*bar- "outside, foreign" as in OffAram., Palm., Hatra., JAram., Syr., Mand. Jp. br(y) "outside, foreign" (NWSI I, 195, 197), CA barru "countryside, usu. *uninhabited and far-stretched*"; barr- "outside". Other derivatives of this root, i.e. [bar], are:

1. Akk. burru "cereal", CA burru, Sab. brr "wheat", BHeb. bar "corn, grain" < [bar-] "field (outside the town, village) as in BHeb., BAram. bar "open field", Syr. barrā id., Sab. brr "open country, plain" (OT, 155; SD, 31; DRS II, 87), CA barru "open land; land, ground (as opposed to 'sea'), etc.

2) CA birrītu [r. brt] "flat land; desert". Layth rightly derived it from barriyya-tu (LA) and thus treated /-t/ as a suffix. It is a fem. suffix (see §2.9 above).

**2.12.43** Sab. hwθr "to lay foundation, groundwork"; mwθr "foundation, lower part, lower storey of building"; 'wθr "low ground" (SD, 166), Qat. šwθr "to lay foundation"; mwθr "foundation" (DRS VII, 661), CA waθara, waθθara "to make foundation". The trilateral [wθr] is closely related to the root in CA θarā "earth, ground" and both are from [ʔ ~ wθ] as in CA 'aθθa = waθθara in meaning; 'aθīθa-tu ~ 'aθīra-tu ~ waθīra-tu fem. "fleshy, fat; plenty of".

Another important meaning expressed by 'aθθa ~ waθθara is to "to tread" = BHeb. \*'āšaš "to press", preserved in 'ašīšā "a pressed cake of dried grapes"; 'āšīš "a foundation, as made by stamping" (OT, 100) = CA 'asās, SL 'asīs (by Imālah), etc. see §2.9.18 above. It seems that *Imālah* was not limited to some ancient Arabic dialects only.

**2.12.44** CA waši'a "be dirty": Akk. šū, zū "dirt, excrements, Mand. š'y "to be filthy, foul, defile" (MD, 385), Sab. šyw "stink of, be contaminated with" (SD, 147), Heb. šo'ā "excrement, ordure", Ge. še'a "smell bad" (HED, 51). The following cognates are based on stem [ša'-]: Har. čēķa "stink, have a bad smell", S. čēķā, W. čēķā "have a bad smell", Z. čīķā id., Tna., Amh., Arg., Ms. čəķa "mud" (HSD, 51) = CA šīķu "bad smell" also "dust". All are from a stem [ša'] and to this stem belong among others HS trilaterals in §2.3.29 above.

**2.12.45** CA *wakru* "nest in a wall or on a tree", whereas *wukna*-tu fem. "nest" (Al 'Ayn V, 402, 410), but, to my understanding, *wukna*-tu is "a shelter or hiding place (of a bird), *though it is never used as a container for holding its eggs and young*". Accordingly, it is not a general term for 'nest', which is expressed in all forms of Arabic, old and modern, by 'uššu, pl. 'a'sāšu. On the other hand, SL *wakr* or *ma-wkara-h* denotes "an underground cell or a large hole in a rock used as a shelter for wild animals, esp. *jackals*" = Eyp. ykr-w pl. "the god who guarded the great tunnel through the earth" (EHD I, 95) with krī-t "habitation, abode" (EHD II, 796). For other cognates see n. 3 and n. 5 below.

1) It is possible that the original meaning of CA [wkr] is “kind of a tunnel or cave” or “underground cell”. LA reports that *Umm Hishām Balawiyyatu* was asked by someone: Where do you live? She replied: in that *hawtatu*. He said: What does *hawtatu* mean? She said: in that *wakratu*, etc. (*hawtatu* = *wakratu* in *meaning*). Uthman, the 3rd Islamic Caliph, says: «*wadidtu ’ann bainanā wa baina (’a)l ’aduwwi hawtat-an...*», where *hawtat* = deep valley, abyss (LA, see r. *hwt*, ultimately from *huwa-tu* id. < *hawā* “fall down, go down”).

2) Jawhari (ṢḤḤ VI, 2215) defines *wukna-tu* as “a nest in a wall or mountain”; CV *ta-wakkana* = CV *ta-makkana* “make oneself able” (cf. *makkana* “make able, enable”<sup>174</sup> also, in Poet., “to sit cross-legged”; *wākinu* “sitting”; *tawakkunu*<sup>175</sup> “leaning on (something) while sitting” (LA). Aṣma’i sees that *wukna-tu* denotes “a shelter into which a bird frequently comes, but it is not its nest”. He also says that both *wukna-tu* and *wakru* are “a place into which a bird enters” (MA, 423; also see LA).

3) On the other hand, Ibin A’rābi defines *wukna-tu* as “a resting-place (of a bird)” (LA), thus = HEGyp *ykn* “resting-place” also “abode” (EHD I, 95) = Tham. *wkr* also expresses “resting-place” (Branden, 1950: 513).

4) Abu Ubaidah considers *wukna-tu* ~ *’ukna-tu* ~ *wuḵna-tu* ~ *’uḵna-tu* as variants of the same form (see LA). The new trilaterals *wuḵna-tu* ~ *’uḵna-tu* means: “hollow or hole in the top of a mountain about two fathoms deep” also “a nest”. The original meaning of the word seems to be “a hole in a mountain-rock used as house”.

5) On the other hand, Ibin Kalabi states that *’uḵn* = ‘house built only with stone’, and that it is one of the common six different types of houses in ancient Arabia (LA). Similarly, Jawhari (ṢḤḤ V, 2071) defines *’uḵna-tu* “a house built with stone” = Akk. *uḵn*- “lapis-lazuli” (AG, 110), Ug. *iḵnu* id. (UG, 536), etc. In Sab. *m-wḵn-t* is ‘terme d’architecture’ (DRS VII, 607) and *m-wḵr-t* “rock-boring” (SD, 161) = SL *m-wkr-h* or *m-wḵr-t* above, where /-h/ is from fem. /-t/.

6) I don’t see any deep semantic difference between *wuḵna-tu* ~ *’uḵna-tu* above and *’ūḵa-tu* ~ *hūḵa-tu*. LA defines *’ūḵa-tu* [r. *’wḵ*] as a place like *a well* or *huwwa-tu*, i.e. *a deep natural hole in the ground*. Ibin Shamīl (in LA, r. *’wḵ*) gives some additional detail:

*«a deep pit in the ground of at least two fathoms deep and its opening is like that of a well but often larger. If its depth is less than two fathoms, then it will not be called ’ūḵah».*

7) There seems to be a proot \*-(W)K(W)- (= \*-k- or \*-ḵ-) having to do with a very general idea “abode, dwelling place”, which is a cave, orig. “place one can hide and seeks protection”. With this view, we are getting very close to \*gw-.

8) To this root may belong Akk. *eyakku*, *yāku* “sanctuaire”, CA *’ayku* “groupe d’arbres, bosquet” (DRS I, 17), Egp. *’kī-t* “chamber, abode” (EHD I, 11). The CA cognate [’yk] occurs four times in the Koran (15: 78, 26: 176, 38: 13, 50: 14) and is

<sup>174</sup> Both *wakkana* and *makkana* are unquestionably from HS *kāna* “to be” (§2.10.3 above).

<sup>175</sup> It is quite evident that the /-n/ of this trilateral is a suffix, and there should be no doubt about it. In addition to *tawakkana*, there are *tawakka’a* “to lean on (a stick while walking or standing)”; *’itti-kā’a* “leaning on” (from \*’iwtikā’a): CI *wakī’a*, etc. r. *wk’*.

always preceded by *ʾaṣḥāb* “people of, owners of, dwellers”: أصحاب الأيكة *ʾaṣḥābu (ʾa)l ʾayka-ti* “dwellers or inhabitants of the wood or of the forest”. The translation given here is wrong since it may give the misleading idea that the meaning is “people who live in the forest”. The word actually signifies “dwelling place on a dense tangled tree” or simply “home on a tree”, contrasting with أصحاب الحجر *ʾaṣḥābu (ʾa)l ḥiġri* “inhabitants of Hijr (= the Rock), i.e. *those who hewed in the rocks abodes* (Koran 15: 80).

It is possible that both *ʾayk* and *ḥijr* were originally *holy places*: comp. Sab. *ḥgr* “talismanic protection” as a vb “to reserve s.t. for exclusive use” (= CA CII *ḥaġġara* id.); *mḥgr(t)* “land reserved for s.o.’s exclusive use (SD, 67) = CA *maḥġaru* “land around a village reserved for someone’s exclusive use”. In addition, CA *ḥiġran ma-ḥġūrā*, a pre-Islamic idiom whose precise meaning may be “(totally) forbidden” and it occurs two times in the Koran (25: 22 and 25: 53). Semitic triliteral [*ḥgr*] denotes “wall; stone” as in Akk. *igaru*, Phoen. *ḥgr* “wall” (PG, 100) = CA *ḥaġāru* “a wall, stone”, with *ḥuġra-tu* fem. “enclosure, room”, BHeb. *ḥāġar* “to bind around, to gird” (OT, 295), Ug. *ḥgr* “to gird on” (UG, 533) = CA *ḥaġara* “to restrain”, Pun. *ḥgr*, Nab. *ḥgr* “wall, enclosure” (NWSI I, 348), etc. In OffAram., Syr., etc. *ḥgr* = “lame” is from a different compound.

9) To the PHS proot under study belong numerous trilaterals among them are [*kwn*] “to establish, to be” (§2.10.3 above), [*ṣkn*] “to dwell” (§2.2.13 above), and so forth. Another previously unmentioned triliteral is CA *wakfu* defined, by Farāḥīdi (Al ʾAyn V, 413), lit. “*like a part or side (in a house) upon which a structure called kanīfu is built*”. LA (r. *wkf*) offers two contradictory definitions: on the one hand, “a structure atop of the *kunna-tu* or *kanīfu*”, and on the other hand, “it is like a part in the house and atop of it there is *kanīfu*”. It becomes apparent that knowledge of the exact meaning of *wakfu* requires an understanding of the meanings of *kanīfu* and *kunna-tu*.

LA [*kn*] defines *kunna-tu* as a structure within a house (as opposed to *ḍulla-tu*, *awning at the front door, which is outside the house*), and identifies it with *sudda-tu*. The word *sudda-tu* means “shed, a structure in front of a house”, nowadays a structure inside a room and is ultimately from *ḥudda-tu*, a word difficult to pronounce (see §2.1.14.2, n. 3 & 3.12.14 above).

LA [*knf*] defines *kanīfu* as “a structure like *kunna-tu* (perh. *a porch*) set up above the entrance of the house”. The word also denotes “enclosure” and “a cover above the entrance”, and is derived, according to LA, from “hide, cover”: kanna id., BHeb. *knf*: *Niph.* “to cover or hide oneself”, *kānāp*, CA *kanafu* “wing, as a cover, protection” (see §2.3.10 above), Sab. *knf* “border, side” (SD, 78).

It seems that both [*knf*] and [*wkf*] are not inside the *kinnu* or “house”, but rather outside, and their final \*-f- is a proot signifying ‘side of kinnu’, most likely ‘front side’, i.e. *the face of*.

All trilaterals cited so far are from a proot \*kW- meaning “dwelling, i.e. *a place, a hole in the ground*”, and is seen in CA *kauw* = *kinnu* = “house” (see LA, r. *wkk*), *kauw* “hole in a wall, small window”, BAram., Syr. *kw* “window” (OT, 450), Sab. *hwky* caus., with prefixed /w-/, “to construct house” (SD, 160), with n- ext.: OffAram. *kwn* “window” (NWSI I, 495). To this proot also belong CA *kahfu* “cave”, Eyp. *kp* “hiding place, refuge” (EHD II, 793), *kʾp* “shelter, place of concealment” (EHD II, 786), Kopt. *kēpi* “vault, cave”, Chad.: Housa *kafā* “hole”, Cush.: Gawwada *kap-ko* “irrigation ditch”

(HSED, n. 1414). To this same proot of course belongs gen. Semitic [kwn] "to be".

**2.12.46** CA waḳṣu "short (of the neck, back, etc.): waḳaṣa "to break" < kaṣṣa "to cut short" (§2.1.9.5, n. d above).

**2.12.47** Egyp. wh' "to seek, enquire for" (179), CA ta-wahhā to inquire into, investigate"; 'istawhā "to ask about or for": Egyp. h' "to touch, feel, seek to find out" (EHD I, 527).

**2.12.48** CA wadasa, said of young herbage, "to cover the earth"; wadsu "the first herbage". The /-s/ of [wds] is clearly from an original /-θ/, which can't occur for seq. const. resulting from the addition of prefixed w- to \*daθ-: Akk. dīš-, Ug. dōt "herbe printanière, printemps", etc. (DRS IV, 322), CA daṯa'u "rain that comes down when grass springs up from the earth (lit. earth vomits forth grass), spring rain". Triliteral dθ' can be studied in depth *only* in connection with [df'] in §2.2.47 above.

**2.12.49** Akk. egū (m) "se fatiguer, être indolent", Aram.: Jp. yegī'ā "pain, effort, travail", Šaf. wg' "être triste, avoir de la peine", etc. (DRS VI, 404), CA waḡi'a "to suffer or undergo pain"; CIV 'awḡa'a "to inflict pain, hurt"; waḡa'u "ailment, ache" as in *waga' ra's* "headache"; *waga' baṭn* "stomach ache", *waḡa' sin* "toothache", etc., BHeb. yāga' "to labor, to toil", esp. *with wearisome and painful effort*, also "be wearied, faint" (OT, 374) and occurred once as "torture" (Ryder, 1974: 99), Berb.: Izyaya iga, Kabyl əgg "make, put", Chad.: Gisiga ge "to do, make", Mwulyen ugo id., Logone ga'e "to build" (HSED, n. 912). All are from \*gaw as in BHeb. yāgā "to grieve"; Piel. hōḡāh "to afflict, grieve", (Ryder, 1974: 103; OT, 373), CA waḡā "to fail to reach, attain, hit, or achieve; despair"; CIV 'auḡā "to push back, thrust aside, repulse", Egyp. yg' "to quiet, subdue" (EHD I, 95).

a) The stem is also seen with various extensions as BHeb. gāwa' "to die" (DRS II, 108), originally "to starve" = Sab. gw' "hunger" (SD, 51), CA ḡū'u id.; ḡā'a "be hungry", with prefixed p-: CA faḡ'ā-nu "glutton, hungry man" > modern dialects, esp. Leb. ta-faḡ'an (-n is part of the root) "to eat greedily" < faḡ'ān "glutton". The Egyp. cognate seems to be s-g' "let perish, destroy" (EHD II, 627)<sup>176</sup>.

**2.12.50** Samal. ybl "river, brook" (NWSI I, 433), Syr. māmōlā, Jp. mabbūla, BHeb. mabbūl (\*maybūl) "inundation, deluge", yābal "to well, flow, esp. *copious and with impetus*", CA wabala "to flow copiously", wābilu, wablu "continuous or copious rain", Amh. wābālo, Gour. wābār "to rain copiously and with wind" (OT, 532; DRS VI, 485) < BHeb. būl "rain", CA būlu "river".

1) The compound \*bW + Wl gives rise to [bal] "pour, wet, water" as in Assy. balālu

<sup>176</sup> There are still some additional trilaterals sharing in common initial \*wg- and expressing "fear, agitation" as in [wgl]: CA waḡila "to apprehend, to fear, be seized with fear", Chad.: Kera walga (by metathesis) "crainte, peur" (DRS VI, 493), [wgr]: BHeb. ygr "to fear, be afraid of", CA waḡira id. (OT, 374), [wgp]: CA waḡafa "to be agitated, to quiver, to palpitate (heart)" ~ [wgb]: CA waḡaba "to palpitate, be agitated"; waḡbu "coward"; mu-waḡḡabu, said of an animal, "afraid of anything", etc. All are from different compounds.

“to pour out” (King, 1898: 339), BHeb. bālal “to pour over, wet all over”, Syr. blī “to sprinkle”, CA bilālu “water”; balalu “dew”; balla “to wet (all over), to moisten”: Chad.: Bachama ḥole “rain”, Sumray belle “rivulet”, Gulfey bellati id. (HSED, n. 260, 312), PEC \*bal- “to wet” (RPAA, n. 13): see §2.3.23.

2) The CA word bīlu is also seen in a compound salsabīlu as in the Koran (76:18): (عينا فيها تسمى سلسيلا) : cf. salisu “fresh (water)” also sabalu “copious rain”; CA sabīlu “flow of water, water for passers-by” = Egyp. š’b’l-θ “stream, flow of water” (EHD II, 725) = BHeb. šibbōl-et fem. “stream”; šābal “to flow copiously” (OT, 1029).

3) The above trilaterals, in addition to [bwl] “urinate”, share in common with [syl] in §2.10.27 above a proot \*’il “torrent of water, flood”. As for proot [b-], see §2.13 below.

**2.12.51** Egyp. w’b “to pour out a cleansed liquid, pour out libations, wash clean”, Cop. wop “to wash”, Chad.: Kusen ubau “wash”, Higi NKafa yəḥu, Kapiski yaḥu, Fali Gili ’eyḥa-, Higi Ghye yaḥa, Bachama yəḥ id. (HSED, n. 2502; EHD I, 155): PHS stem [’ab] in Egyp. ’b “purify, make clean”; ’bw “libations, washings with water”, etc. see §2.2.22, esp. n. d above.

**2.12.52** BHeb. yāgab “to cut” (OT, 373) = CA ḡabba, CIV ’aḡabba id., Chad.: Angas gap “to cut”, Chip gəp, Ankwe gup, Montol gap (HSED, n. 2555). PHS stem [gab], a compound of proot ga- (see §2.83 below) and proot [ba-] “cut” (see §2.2.20 above).

**2.12.53** CA waš’u “small, *only of birds*” is from ša’wu id., Cush.: Sid. çe’aa “bird”, Darasa, Kambatta, Hadiya, Kabenna, Bamabla, Tambaro ḥi’a id. (HSED, n. 500). There are some trilaterals sharing in common the first and second radicals [š’] and expressing “small” as in ša’la-tu “smallness of the head” also “thin”; ’aš’alu “one with small head”, ši’wanu [š’n] “one with a thin neck and small head” as a vb CIV ’aš’ana, ša’nabu [r. š’nb] “having a small head”, muša’laku [r. š’lk] “having a small and round head”, šu’rūbu [r. š’rb] “having a small head”, etc. I think that the original meaning of [š’] is “pointed, sharp or tapered end”.

Some other trilaterals are [šm’], by infixed /-m-/, is definitely from [š’]: ’ašma’u “one with small head”; šami’a “to have a small ears sticking to the head”; šauma’a-tu fem. “hermitage”, so-called *on the account that its top is pointed* (LA), with suffixed -t, orig. forming nouns from verbs, becoming part of the root: šam’atū-tu [šm’t] masc. “one with pointed head” with no other derivatives. We have already seen the infixed /-m-/ in §2.10, n. 5a-5b above.



## 2.13 PHS PREFIXED /b/:

### *Compounds With Initial Proot /baW-/*

A careful examination of all Egypto-Semitic roots beginning with radical [b-] reveals the abundance of compounds consisting of a proot [b-] plus one or more proots. Such proots are compounded together to form what we have long been accustomed to call a *biliteral root*, *triliteral root*, etc. The proot [baW] is a cover symbol for a prehistorically limited number of monosyllables, each having its signification. Illustrative examples are:

**2.13.1** Egypt. byθíw pl. “professional men” is a compound comprising two proots [by] signifying here “professional” and a proot [θí] “learned man” (EHD II, 852). Proot [by] also expresses “character, quality, disposition, characteristic, moral worth, reputation” as in *byy-t byn* “evil-natured (or evil disposition ~ character + evil): byn “evil, wicked” (EHD I, 211) = perh. CA *bayy*<sup>177</sup>. Note that Egypt. proot [by] interchanges with [b’].

2.13.2 Egypt. bs “teacher, instructor” (EHD I, 222): s’ “know” (EHD I, 587, 633). The first element [b-] is the same as that in §2.13.1 above.

**2.13.3** Egypt. bḥws “a kind of stone” and SL baḥṣ coll. “small stone” are both from a compound of [buW] “place” and a stem [ḥws] coll. “small stones”. The first part of the compound is seen in Egypt. bw “place, house”, etc. see §2.9.22 above, SL buḥṣaiṣā fem. (from buḥṣaiṣa-tu) “place of small stones”, and the second in Egypt. ḥws “a kind of stone”, SL as well as CA ḥaṣā coll. “small stone”, sg. ḥaṣā-t, SL ḥuṣṣ “stone of a ring”, Akk. ḥiṣṣu “gravel”, BHeb., Syr. ḥṣṣ “small stone, gravel-stone”, Ge. ḥōṣā id. (EHD I, 220, 473, OT, 338).

Some examples illustrating the use of [buw] as an independent proot in Egypt. phrases are:

- a) *bw nfr* “place of happiness” (nfr “happy”; nfr-t “happiness”).
- b) *bw wr* “place of greatness” (wr “great, greatness”).

A similar example from CA is bu’ra-tu “fire place in the ground, hole for a fire”, from bū-, i.e. ب = bw “place” and ’irra-tu fem. “fire”.

---

<sup>177</sup> CA *bayy* used only in a fixed expression «hayyu-nu binu bayy-ān». With the exception of *binu* “son”, all old Arab scholars do not know the exact meaning of both ‘*hay*’ and ‘*bay*’ here, nor do they know the exact meaning of the expression as a whole. Ibin A’rābi assumes, however, that ‘*bay-ān*’ signifies “mean, vile” (cf. Egypt. b’n “evil, bad”), but there is no evidence to confirm this assumption. According to some others, the expression is said to a person whose father is unknown (LA). The only evidence we have is that the expression as a whole expresses “baseness, meanness”. In my opinion, there are two possibilities: *hay* is a pers. name and *bay* is an old dial. form for “father”, and so it is in most modern dialects. Any person whose father is unknown is often called *bin ’abī-h* “son of his father”; a well-known historical example is Ziyād bin ’abīh. Accordingly, *bin bay* = “son of a father”. Otherwise, ‘*son of hatred*’.

**2.13.4** Egyp. bk “to work, to labour” (EHD I, 225) is from a longer form b’k “to work, to labour, to serve, do service” (EHD I, 206), and this in turn from a compound of [b’] and [k’] as in Egyp. k’-t “work, labor, toil” (EHD II, 784). One should note here that proot [ba’] combines with a noun to form a verb, as [d’] and many others proots do. For Semitic cognates, see §2.4.11 above.

**2.13.5** Egyp. b’nd “to bind, to tie” ~ bnd id., SL bannada “to tie, esp. a lace, called bind”: Egyp. nd, ndd id. (EHD I, 219, 409): nw “to bind, tie”, caus. s-nw id. (EHD I, 351; II, 676)

**2.13.6** Egyp. bykr “excellent, good”: ykr “excellent, good” (EHD I, 93, 211).

**2.13.7** Egyp. bg “be exhausted, weak, feeble, destitute of strength, helpless”; bgg “be helpless, do nothing, be inert”; bgí “the helpless, the weak, the inert”; bgys “feeble, weak” (EHD I, 225): Egyp b’g “be helpless, feeble, needy, inactive, empty of strength, wretched”: ’g “to lack, to want”: g(’) “be in sore straits, in great need, in distress, suffer want, deprived of s.t., empty of” (EHD I, 12, 207; II, 800). For Sem. cognates, see §2.12.5, under *Comments*, n. 3 above.

**2.13.8** Egy. bk’ “to bulge out, swell (of the belly of a pregnant woman)”; bk’t “a pregnant woman”, Copt. boki “be pregnant” (EHD I, 225): Egyp. b’k’ “be pregnant” (EHD I, 207) also b’k’ “pregnant”, bwg-t “pregnant woman”. The CA compound cognate is bāka, said of a male animal “to have sexual intercourse with” (while nāka, said of a man, id. = Egyp. nyk “to copulate”).

**2.13.9** Egyp. bk-t “the morning sky”; bk’t “morning, tomorrow morning, light of dawn”; bk’ “shine, illumine, be bright” (EHD I, 225): Egyp. b’k’ “morning, sunrise” = CA bukra-tu “tomorrow morning” also “early morning, sunrise” (Koran, 19: 11, 25: 5, 54: 38); bākir- adv. “early morning” = BHeb. bkr “morning, dawn, next morning” (OT, 154), Mand. bkr “be early, bring forth early”, etc. gen. Sem. (MD, 65). We also have EHeb. bkyr “first-ripening, early”<sup>178</sup>, Phoen. bkr “first born” (NWSI I, 164) = CA bikru id.

1) Since [ba’] expresses ‘light, splendor, illumination’, it is left, as logic tells, for [-k-] to stand for “god, sky”. The original meaning of the root would be “light of the sky” as *bahā* “light of the sun” and \**duwḥ*- “light of the sun (late in the morning after *yudwa*-tu), daylight”. However, logic can only work here when the ultimate origin of a linguistic form is ascertained. It is impossible to establish the form without a close study of CA [fgr] (see §2.21.3.6 below).

2) The interchange of /k/ and /ḳ/ in Heb. finds a parallel in Egyp., where /k/ interchanges with /ḳ/ and also with /g/ (see §3.13.8 above): comp. *bḳ*’ “light, sunrise” as a vb “to shine, be bright” and *bg* “to shine, be splendid”, *kḫkḫ* and *kḫkḫ* “old”, *k*’ and *ḳ*’ “high”, *ḳ’ḳ*’ “to look at, peep, pry into” *g*’ “to look, see”; *g’g*’ “to ogle, make eyes at”,

<sup>178</sup> The BHeb. word is phonemically and semantically identical with SL CII n. bakkīr “early”; bawākīr pl. “early-ripping (of fruit).

š'kr ~ š'gr “ring”, š'kík ~ š'kík ~ š'gíg “delight in”, etc. Interchanges of consonant phonemes with the same or similar point of articulation have already been drawn attention to and illustrated on numerous occasions (see above §§2.1.6.5 n. a & b, also comp. 2.1.6.5.1 and 2.1.6.5.2; 2.1.14.3, under *Comments* I & II; 2.2.50; 2.2.48; 2.2.51; 2.2.55; 2.2.59; 2.2.56.4; 2.3.10; 2.3.31; 2.3.32; 2.3.34, under *Comments*; 2.12.1, esp. n. 4; etc.<sup>179</sup>). The only explanation of this phenomenon is that feature ‘voice’ was not phonemic in early PHS. Otherwise, we will end up reconstructing variants of a proot differing from one another in ‘voice’ as autonomous PHS roots such as [s-kr] ~ [s-gr] “to shut up, close” (§3.2.56.4 above) and [š-kr] “to hire, rent” (§3.2.14 above) ~ [ʾ-gr] (§3.3.4 above). It is only in late PHS that ‘voice’ began to emerge as a result of sound change. It is almost always the case that when separate proots or words and affixes are combined to form new words, the neighboring sounds influence one another and as a result a change takes place. This phenomenon may account for some types of change, and among the most important of such types are:

a) *Dissimilation*: see §2.17.80 below.

b) *Assimilation*: illustrated with many examples in this research.

c) *Metathesis* as in Egyp. bḥs “to reckon, count” = CA ḥsb id.; Ug. mrḥ “spear”, Egyp. mʾrḥ id. = CA rmḥ id., etc. Other very important causes of change that have left a deep impress upon phonology, morphology and lexicon are ‘*phonotactics*’, ‘*reduction of syllables*’, and ‘*attaching affixes permanently to roots*’. A subject we will discuss in §2.25 below.

**2.13.10** Egyp. bʾl “greatness of the eye”: PHS stem ʾal “eye” also “see”. The Egyp. trilateral also signifies “blind” and consists of neg. [b] plus \*ʾl. For neg. [b-] and [ʾl], see §2.21.5 below.

**2.13.11** CA bukmu “muteness or dumbness” as in the Koran: (صم بكم عى فهم لا يرجعون), (they are) *deaf, dumb, and blind*; (hence) *they will not return* (from their darkness) (1:18): PHS stem [kam]. See §3.17.79, n. 2 below.

A scientific study of HS [km] and CA [bkm] must take into account CA baḡam I “to keep silent, unable to speak”. For baḡam II, see §2.28 below.

**2.13.12** CA bakara-tu “spool, reel, pulley, any circular object”; MSA bikāru “a compass”: PHS stem \*kur- as in CA kura-tu fem. “ball, globe, sphere”, Akk. kakkaru “disk, round bread”, Heb. kikkār id., Chad. Kera kaakəray “arm-ring”, Maha korkor

<sup>179</sup> Some additional examples of interchanges of /k/ and /g/ are: CA kuθwa-tu ~ ḡuθwa-tu “a heap of soil” sakku ~ saḡḡu “excrement”; ḡlḡ ~ ḡlḡ “restlessness”; karāḥu “water, usu. unmixed, pure”, karāʾu “water, usu. coming from rains or sky” as a vb karaʾa “to drink that water” = ḡaraʾa also expresses “to drink” (nowadays its scope of application is confined to “dose of medicine”) = šaraʾa “to drink, usu. animals”; ma-šraʾa-tu “source of water” also, like šarīʾa-tu, širāʾu, “path leading to water”, Sab. šṛʾ-t “irrigation” (SD, 133-134); Sab. gyb ~ kyb “to protect, defend” (SD, 51, 80), BHeb. wgp “to strike, gore”, Assy. wakāpu id.; CA krr “a measure” ~ Akk. gurru id.; BHeb. nsk “to weave” = CA nsḡ id., etc. Cush.: Ga. luka “leg” = Som. luug id.; Ga. daka “to go” = Som. tag id.; Ga. buke “flank” = Som. bog id. (Zaborski, 1975: 327). Egyp. grḥ ~ krḥ “night”, grg “to equip, furnish” ~ krk “be equipped”, etc. One may also comp. /k/ and /š/ as in CA šarā “to buy” and karā in §2.2.14, etc.

“round” (HSED, n. 1416, 1481).

**2.13.13** We have seen in §2.11.81 above that *γaz* expresses “to prick, sting (with a needle or anything with a pointed end)”. To this stem we can prefix or suffix /b/ as in *bayaza* ~ *γazaba* id. The change in the order of [γz] can not affect the meaning, hence *bazaya* id.

**2.13.14** CA *’ablā* [bly] “to swear (to)” as in Poet.

«wa *’innī* la- *’ublī* (’a)n nāsi fī ḥubbi *γairihā*  
fa-’ammā *’alā* ḡuml-in fa-’innī lā *’ublī*»

We have two different forms of passive *’ublī*. In the 1<sup>st</sup> line the form expresses “to afflict with suffering, put on trial” (see §2.3.24 above) and in the 2<sup>nd</sup> “to swear”. This latter form is a compound of [b-] and \*-l-. The second element is seen in CA *’illu* “covenant, pledge” also the term for “ally”, BHeb. *’ālā* “an oath, oath of covenant” (OT, 53), Phoen. *’lt*, Aram.: Ya. *’lh* “agreement” (DRS I, 20). This word is most likely a compound of *’ī*, *’iy* “swear, oath” > *wa’y* “pledge”; *wa’ā* “to pledge, promise”, a variant *’awā* occurs. Its Egyp. cognate is caus. *y-w’y* “pledge, guarantee” (EHD I, 32).

One can also say, using [’l] above: *’ālā*, the only one in use in modern times. Consider the following sentence: *wa’ay-tu* ~ *’away-tu* ~ *’ālay-tu* *’ala* (= on) *naḡsī* (= myself) “I pledged/promised myself”.

**2.13.15** CA *baḥtara*, *ta-baḥtara* (= SL *t-maḥtar* or *ta-maḥtar* (with /b/ and /m/ being interchanged, *t-bḥtar* can, however, be understood) “to have a graceful gait, to swagger, to strut” (DRS II, 59) is obviously from *ḥaṭara* = *tabaḥtara* in meaning, and this is from *ḥaṭā* “to step”.

**2.13.16** CA [byy] expresses, according to Bin Faris (ML I, 271) two root meanings: (a) “wishing for, searching for” and (b) “a type of corruption” as follows:

a) CA *bayā*, CVIII *’ibtayā* “to wish for, desire, want” *buyya-tu* “a wish, desire”; *mubtayā* “sought after, wished for”, Akk. *ba’ū*, *bu’ū* “look for”, OAram., OffAram., Hatra, Palm., Nab. *b’y* “to search for, look for, to want” also ‘require’ as in: *’lhy yb’wn mnḥ* “May the gods require from him”. In CA *’ālihah* “gods” must follow *yabyūn*, Mand. *ba-* [b’y] “to desire, beg, wish, ask, demand, seek”, SA: Mhr. *beyat* “wish”, Chad.: Logone *bḡ’a* “not wish” (NWSI I, 180; HSED, n. 362; MD, 44): PHS *\*γaW-* “goal, wish” as in CA *γāya-tu* “goal, aim aimed at”.

b) CA *bayyu* “injustice, corruption”; *bāy-in* “tyrant”; *bayā* “to wrong, oppress; to commit adultery” is from a stem *\*γaW-* as in *γaiyu* “seduction”; *γawā* “to err, go astray”, etc. (see §2.1.6.5.13 above).

**2.13.17** CA *baḥasa* “to undervalue something, lower the value or price of, to belittle”; *baḥsu* “low, cheap” < CA *ḥasīsu* “mean, vile, base, low”; *ḥissa-tu* “meanness, vileness”, *hassa* “to diminish, decrease, belittle”, Sab. *hss* “to harm, injure; one who injures, damages” (SD, 62), and with infixed -y-: *ḥys* “to act treacherously against” (SD, 64) = CA *ḥāsa* id., also in CA “to break a pledge or a covenant”. In addition, the CA verb

denotes “to offer to buy from or give to somebody something and you end up paying or giving much less than the amount already agreed upon”.

**2.13.18** Egyp. *bḥwd* “seat, throne, throne on steps, stairs” ~ *bḥd* “seat, throne” < *ḥwd* “throne” (EHD I, 420, 474). The Semitic cognate may be the one seen in CA *ḥaidu* “a jutting out, or protruded, side of the mountain that looks like a wing”, Sab. *ḥwd* “recess excavated in hillside”, OffAram. *ḥwd* perh. “mountain-top” (NWSI I, 353), but this Semitic root is apparently cognate with Egyp. *ḥ’d* “caverns in the mountain”. Also comp. Egyp. *ḥwd-t* “winged disk” > *bḥwdd* “spread out the wings”.

**2.13.19** HS [b’r] expresses a number of unrelated root meanings:

1) BHeb. *bā’ar* “to burn up, consume by fire”, BAram. *bə’ar* “to burn” (OT, 148), Mand. *bar* “to burn, burn with rage” (MD, 49), Chad.: Tera vara “to burn”, Kera boore “warm up”, Montol biar “heat” (HSED, n. 282), etc. are from \*b- plus proot [’ar]. The proot is seen in CA and Egyp. with caus. /s-/: *s-’ar* (see §2.2.56.3 above).

2) The Semitic root [b’r] also express “to feed upon, to consume” as in BHeb. “to glean”, in Syr. *b’r* “to consume, devour”, in Mand. “poverty”, CA *ba’ru* “complete and continuous poverty”, SL *ba’war* “to search for anything to eat (e.g. *fruit*) at the end of summer”. All these words are compounds of {b- + ’ar} as follows:

2a) For BHeb. & Syr. words: cf. SL *’arr* “to devour, swallow food”.

2b) For Mand. & CA words: cf. CA *mu’tarru* [’r] “poor”.

3) Ug. *b’r* “to rob, plunder” (UG, 535, 536): CA *’arra* “to oppress, insult, and rob one of his money”.

4) Ugr *b’r* also expresses “to lead” (UG, 533) and so does ybl. It is possible that “to lead” is derived from a term for ‘*animal*’ which leads or moves in front of the flock or herd: ybl in Sem. = “*ram*” and *b’r* “*bull*”: cf. CA *’airu* can express ‘*donkey*’ and (when followed by *people*) “leader or master of the people”.

5) The trilateral is also the HS term for “a kind of bull, cattle” as in OAkk. *būru* “young bull”, CA *ba’ru* “beast of burden, ass”, etc. It is possible that the word is a compound of \*b- “big” and \*’īr “ass” (CA *’īr*, Ug. *’r*, etc. “ass”).

6) Apart from \*b-’r, I have noticed that /b/ can be combined with nouns to express “strong, big, much, great (> hence, arrogance)” and the like. For example, CA *rīḥu* expresses “wind” = Ug. *rḥ id.* (UG, 537), Phoen. *rḥ id.* (PG, 145), etc. > CA *bāriḥu* “strong wind”. Also, compare CA *bu’kūku* “intense heat” with *’akku* (§3.12.25 above), and *zaydu* “growl, roar” with *zuydubu*. Farāḥīdi considers /-b/ of [zṽdb] as a suffix (Al ‘Ayn IV, 463) but, as usual, he did not determine its meaning. Actually, /-b/ adds to the trilateral a notion “audible, loud, strong”, and perh. “large, big”.

7) Syr. *b’r* “excrements”, CA *ba’ru* “dung (of some hoofed and padded animals, except cow), etc. all are from [b’r] “bull, cattle” above, but ultimately from \*b- + [’r] as in CA *’urru* “excrement of birds, of people”.

**2.13.20** CA *baha’a* expresses “to kill”, esp. *kill oneself and is often followed by ‘nafs’* “self” in Poet. and the Koran (18: 6 and 26: 3). It is defined by Bin Faris (ML I, 206) as expressing ‘*killing*’ and notions that are closely related to it like ‘*humiliation and*

*subjection*’ as in *baha’a*, said of a sheep, “to cut up the bone of its neck”, but if the ‘cut’ is less severe we use *naha’a*. The trilateral is based on [hʿ] and this biliteral is seen in Egyp. *hʿi* “to kill, to slay” (EHD I, 535). Other derivatives of [hʿ] are Egyp. *hʿm* “to make to bow, to suppress” = CA [hʿm], preserved in the word *hai’ama-tu* “evil (man)” ~ *hai’aba-tu* id., Egyp. *hʿr* “hide, skin” = perh. CA *hʿl* “fur, a kind of dress made of hide”, Egyp. *hʿr* “be angry, to rage” = CA *hʿr*, preserved in *hai’ara-tu* “rashness, recklessness”. Among other derivatives of [hʿ] is [hnʿ], with infixed /-n-/, as in CA *hunū’u* “servile obedience, cringing” as a vb *hana’a*.

**2.13.21** We have already seen in §2.1.12, n. 3 above that HS stem [ḡar-] expresses “to scatter”, and that to this proot some grammatical prefixes may be added to form new triliterals exactly as we add prefixes and other affixes to any Semitic trilateral to create new derivatives.

Prefixing \*b- to [ḡar-] yields a new trilateral [bḡr], which expresses the same meaning as that of \*ḡar- as in BHeb. *bāzar* “to scatter, disperse” (OT, 121), BAram. *bdr* “to scatter” (Rosenthal, 1963: 79), OffAram. *bdr* “to scatter, disperse” (NWSI I, 145), Mand. *bdr* “to strew, scatter, disperse” (MD, 52), CA *baḡara* “to scatter, sow seed”, SA: Meh. *bezār*, Shh *bizer* “seed”, Chad.: Mbu, Jamb. *vazar* “corn”, Tala *bazr* id. (HSED, n. 269).

SL *baḡar* “to scatter, only *seeds*, esp. *grain seeds along the furrows of a plowed-field*”, hence *bizre-h* “seed” (also offspring), pl. *bezr*, whereas *ḡarā* “to scatter, disperse”. This shows clearly that \*b- adds the notion of “seed” to the meaning of *ḡarā*, and it is a true cognate form of Egyp. [bʿ] “grain seed, a kind of grain”.

**2.13.22** CA *bayamu* “sound, noise (of deer)”; *bayama* “make a sound, noise (deer)”: cf. *yamyama-tu* “incomprehensible utterance or speech”, perh. from a compound of \*b- and \*-γ-, a sound made to make an infant laugh or stop crying, and is pronounced *ʿiy*, *ya*, *ʿiyya*, also *kiyya*. The verbal form is *kāya* ~ *ʿayya* ~ *nāyā* below.

a) To the proot \*-γ- also belong *nāyā* [nyy/w], which signifies in SL “say *ʿiy* to an infant” and in CA *nāyā* “speak tenderly (mother to her baby); courtship”; *naywa-tu* ~ *maywa-tu* “melody, tune”, also CA *nayamu* [nym], the most commonly used term in modern times, “melody, tune, harmony of sounds”.

b) Prefixing h- to [n-γ] gives rise to a new trilateral CA [hny] in CIII *hānaya* arch. “courtship, speak tenderly to” (Al ʿayn III, 361), a word difficult to pronounce, and, for this reason, it has never been widely used.

c) Similarly, CA *ruyāʿu* “the characteristic cry of a hoofed animal” (LA, r. *ryy/-w*) is a compound of \*r- (meaning ?) plus \*-γ-, BHeb. *rwʿ*: *Hiph*. “to cry with a loud voice, to shout”. Its *Niph*. stem expresses “to suffer evil, become evil” (OT, 970-971): CA *rāwaya* “to dodge, swerve”, and is usu. used with a fox.

c) The trilateral [wyy] also contains the proot \*-γ- as in *wayā* “noise, clamor, tumult (heard in war)”, hence developing into “war, battle” and “a kind of small insect”, from the *audible noise* it produces, SA: Jib. *sēyi* “appeler” (DRS VII, 581).

d) The proot \*-γ- is also seen in *yauyāʿa* fem. “clamor, tumult”, masc. *ʿaywayu*, hence developing into “vulgar, mob, riff-raff”.

e) There are indeed numerous other trilaterals based on the proot \*-γ-. An important one of them is perh. CA γannā “to sing”<sup>180</sup>, BHeb. ‘ny, Egyp. ‘’nn id.; ‘’n’ty “singing-woman” = CA γāniya-tu id. (EHD I, 111).

f) To my understanding, CA θuyā’ “bleating (of an ewe)”, hence θāyiya-tu “ewe”, contains the proot \*-γ-, and is thus a compound consisting of \*θa’- “ewe”, i.e. fem. \*θā-t or \*θā’, plus \*γ. The word [θā] = Ug. θa-t “ewe” (UG, 530). The same word is seen as šā-/šā-in HS as in Akk. šu’u “sheep”, Ug. š, Heb. šē id., CA šā-, šā’u, etc. (§2.1.5, ft. 1), also Egyp. s’w, syw “sheep”. The term θa’- is found in the compound [θ’ġ] (see §2.17.78 below).

Finally, attention should be *carefully paid to the fact* that /γ/ interchanges with /g/ (§2.11.58 above) and in some cases with /’/.

**2.13.23** CA baġġala “to dignify, exalt”; mu-baġġalu “honorable, venerable”: ’aġalla CIV of [ġal] “to dignify, esteem, venerate”; ġalīlu “honorable, venerable, momentous, glorious”; ġalāla-tu “majesty, sublimity”.

**2.13.24** Ug. brḥ “to flee” (UG, 532), Phoen. brḥ “to flee, fly” (PG, 91), BHeb. brḥ “to pass through, reach across, flee” (OT, 157), Chad.: Tangale bar- “to go out”, Warji var id., Gera bōrə, Glm bar- “to return”, Angas bar “to escape”, Dangla birē “to go”, Dahalo bariy- “to go out, depart” (HSED, n. 230), CA CI bariḥa, CIII bāraḥa “to depart, leave” < CA rāḥa “to go (away), depart”.

1) A careful examination of CA [brḥ] and [rwḥ] shows clearly that the trilaterals are closely connected with the notion of ‘sun’: cf. barāḥu “the sun” and rāḥa “go, depart, etc. *after the setting of the sun*” (n. 3 below). I strongly believe that barāḥu is originally a special term designating ‘the setting sun’ and not ‘the sun’. The belief is grounded on three facts:

1a) The verb commonly used with barāḥu is dalaka-t “to set (final -t in the verb is a pers. pron. referring to the following subject, i.e. *the sun*)”. Bin Faris (ML II, 297) sees that /dlk/ signifies *the disappearance of s.t. smoothly or gently*.

1b) The derivative ’al-bāriḥa-tu is one of two common terms for “yesterday”, the second being ’ams (for a third term, see §2.17.15 below). In modern dialects \*l- > m-: (i)mbēriḥ “yesterday”. Old Arab scholars derive the term from baraḥa “pass away” or bariḥa “to vanish, disappear”.

1c) [’al-] above is, to my understanding, etymologically different from all /’al’s/ in the language. For example, this /’al/ has nothing to do with /’al/ “the” as in ’al kitābu “the book”, with /’al/ “this” as in ’al yawmu lit. “this day, i.e. *today*”, with /’al/ “of” as in bābu ’al baiti “door of the house”, and so forth. It should also be noted that while kitābu, yawmu, and baiti can freely be used without the particle /’al/, bāriḥa-tu, on the other hand, can *never* be used with the signification “yesterday” without /’al/. As it stands, the word signifies “leaving its place, disappearing from its place”. It seems thus that \*’al- is an essential component of the semantic structure of the term ‘yesterday’.

2) Besides, CA barāḥu also signifies “visible, clear”; bariḥa “become visible,

<sup>180</sup> CA ganna arch., said of flies, “to sing while flying”.

apparent” = Akk. *barāhu* “to radiate, shine”, Syr. *baraḥ* “become clear”, Ge. *barāḥ*, Tna. *bārḥe* “bald, bare, naked” (= CA *barāḥu* “outstretched land with no trees and houses, i.e. ‘naked’, from “be visible, shining”), Amh. *bärra* “be luminous, clear” (DRS I, 83).

2a) Arab lexicographers distinguish between *barāḥu* “the sun” and *birāḥu* “placing the palm of the hand near the eyes to avoid looking at the sun”. The latter word is correctly regarded as a compound of *bi* “with” and *rāḥa-tu* “palm of the hand” (= Ug. *rḥ-t*, etc. gen Sem. id.: cf. UG, 533): cf. Jamharh I, 237; ŞHH I, 355f; LA, r. *brḥ*. As for the sentence *dalaka-t barāḥu* “the sun set”, to Ibin Durayd (ibid.) *dalaka* expresses “to hang down, suspend” = *dalla*, *ta-dalla* id. (§3.2.7 above), and *dulūku* = *γurūbu* “sunset”, i.e. *inclining downward to the West, setting*. In this case one may ask: *What is the meaning or function of \*-k?* It is to be born in mind that one can express the same sort of meaning without /-k/ as in *ta-dalla-t*, said of the sun, “be about to set” (MA, 149).

3) For what concerns [rwḥ], old Arab scholars assume that *rāḥa*, CII *rauwaḥa* “to leave/ go away/depart in the evening right *after the setting of the sun*”, hence the original meaning of *rawāḥu* is “*after sunset*” as in the PIP of Khansa:

«...mawāḥi’u yādin li-l-manūni wa *rā’ihī*» (DK, p. 28, L. 2), where *rā’ih-* “going in the evening; i.e. *after sunset*”, the antonym of *yādi(n)* in the line above.

LA (r. *rwḥ*) asserts that:

«*rawāḥu* is the antonym of *ṣabāḥu* (= the morning), and is used as a term for time. It is said: *rawāḥu* means evening, and it is also said: *rawāḥu* (is the time) from sunset to night».

A similar definition was earlier proposed by Jawhari (ŞHH I, 368). The same meaning also occurs in the following Hadith:

«*lā yadwatun ’aw rawḥatun fī sabīli-l-lāhi: yadwa-tu is ’al-marrah* (= nouns that express the doing of an action once) of *γuduw*, which is ‘going at the beginning of the daylight’, the antonym of *rawāḥu*» (LA r. *γdy/w*).

Both terms occur in this line of the PIP:

«...naslubu (’a)l mulka *γudwatan* wa *rawāḥa*» (DM, p. 22, line 1).

In Tham. *rḥ* expresses “voyager le soir” (Branden, 1950: 518), a meaning identical with that of CA *rāḥa*, Cush.: Rendille *raaḥ* “to follow”, Chad.: Dira *riya* “to run”, Cagu *rey*, Nigizim *rəwə* “to run”, Bolewa, Kirfi, Gera *rii* “to enter”, Ankwe *ru* “to enter” (HSED, n. 2103).

4) Why is it that the signification of *rawāḥu* centers heavily on the notion of ‘*sun*’? Is the word a compound of two elements *\*r-* and *\*-wḥ*, and one of these two elements originally stands for “*sun*”? I believe that the word in question is a compound, and that its second element *\*wḥ* represents a Semitic proot for “*sun*”. The element *\*wāḥu* is seen with prefixed *\*y-* in CA *yūḥu* ~ *yūḥā* “*sun*” (LA, r. *ywḥ*), later giving rise to *waḥā* “*fire*”. The initial *\*y-* could be a prefix (§2.6 above) or, more likely, a variant of *\*w-* since *\*wūḥu* (i.e. *wuwḥu* حو) is impossible to pronounce and, for this reason, it has never been used.

4a) The foregoing discussion points to one single proot from which all trilaterals cited above and so many others (some of them discussed below) have been formed by means of affixes or compounding two or more proots. The proot contains a radical *\*-ḥ-*



preceded or followed by a semivowel /y, w, ʾ/: cf. comp. Egyp. ḥʾ “the sun, light-giver” (EHD I, 459), ḥʾḥ “to lighten” (EHD I, 8) = CA ʾuḥāḥu “very hot”, BHeb. ʾaḥ “brazier”, Pun. ḥt pl. of ḥ id. (DRS I, 15).

SL ʾaḥ “hot”, used only when talking to a baby. We also say in a freezing weather: ḥaw ḥaw (Is it ‘sun sun’ or ‘fire fire?’): comp. Ge. ḥaw “fire”, Cush.: Ag., Bil., Ch. haū y “to burn” (VPHS, 104, n.133).

4b) On the other hand, CA ḥawā “to charm (a snake) by reciting words of power” is certainly related to OAkk. [ʾʾʾ], i.e. \*ḥwy “to speak” (Gelb, 1961: 182), BHeb. ḥwy “to reveal, to inform, to declare, to show”, BAram. ḥwy “to reveal, make known”, TA ḥwy “to say, speak”, OffAram., Hatra, DAram. ḥwy “to show, make known, report” (OT, 298; NWSI I, 353-354; Ryder, 1974: 110, 138), etc. All are related to CA waḥā “to reveal or communicate a secret or a message to”; ʾawḥā “to suggest, hint at (in speech)”. The proverb «*waḥyun fī ḥaḡar*» is used, according to Azhari, when something is *apparent and manifest* (LA, r. wḥy). The same meaning is also expressed by ḥaw as in the proverb: «*lā ya ʾrifu (ʾa)l ḥauwa min (ʾa)l lauwa*», where *ḥauwa* denotes “a clear or obvious expression”, whereas *lauwa* denotes “vague expression (from lawā “twist”, gen. Sem. lw- id.)” (LA r. ḥwy). Cognates are: OffAram., Palm. yḥʾ “to prescribe, decree; announcement” as in *hyk dy nmwsʾ mwḥʾ* (order SV) = *as the law prescribes* (NWSI I, 453-454) = CA *kamā* (or dial. *hayk*) *yūḥī* (ʾa)n *nāmūsu* (order VS) id. The real meaning of *yūḥī* here is “reveals, hints at, suggests” with *mūḥī* (i.e. *muwḥy*) “revealing”. All are from the notion of “shining”. The signification of HS [ḥwy] has also been preserved in CA fa-ḥwā “meaning, signification”.

5) By using the symbols *M* and *N* to represent the first and second radicals of the proot, the morphological structures of compounds [rwḥ], [brḥ], and other related trilaterals are as follows:

5a) [rwḥ] is a compound of \*[raw-] “to go, move” plus *MN* “sun”. The significations “after sunset, evening, the setting of the sun” are from “the sun (is) gone” > “to go/move/depart at that time”. The proot [raw] corresponds to Egyp. rw “to depart, go away” (EHD I, 420).

5b) CA [bwḥ] as in *bāḥa* “to manifest, appear, disclose”; *būḥu* “sun”, is a compound of \*bW- “to shine, shed light, bring to light” and *MN*. The proot \*bW- is seen in Semitic with a number of extensions, the most widespread of which is n-ext.: CA *bāna* “become visible, be clear or evident”; *baiyana* “to manifest, throw light on, demonstrate”; CV *tabaiyana* “to get to know”, Ug. *byn* “to know” (UG, 533), Tham. *bn* “be clear, evident”, Palm. *byn* “to elucidate”, etc. (DRS II, 62), Mand. *bun*, *bnn* “to show forth, demonstrate, distinguish, consider” (MD, 55), EHeb. *byn* “cause to understand” (NWSI I, 152).

The Semitic suffix \*-n in [byn] is linguistically identical with the Semitic \*-n that forms nouns from verbs, e.g. *brh* “see, show” > *brhn* “evidence” > *brhn* (by conversion) “to prove”. The suffix has already been discussed and illustrated in §2.11 above. For the origin of Semitic [byn], CA *bayya* CII “to bring to light, throw light upon” > *bayānu* “showing, manifestation; manifest” (by conversion) > *baiyana* “to manifest, show, make visible” = Egyp. bʾ-t “illumination, light, splendor” (EHD I, 200).

5c) [brḥ] is a compound consisting of \*b- + \*-r- “go, move” + *MN*. To the proot *MN* belong many other trilaterals. Among them are the following:

5d CA *ḏaiḥu* [r. *ḏyḥ*] “the sun”. This trilateral and the three triliterals cited below are from a compound of \**ḏW-* “light”, as in CA *ḏau’u* id.; *ḏā’a* “to light, illumine”, and *MN*.

5e) CA *ḏaḥā* [r. *ḏḥy/w*] “expose oneself to the sun”; *ḏaḥa-t* “to rise in the sky, appear” (final -t refers to *the sun*); *ḏuḥā* “forenoon” also “daylight, day” as in the Koran (93:2): (والضحى، والليل إذا سجدى); *ḏaḥḥā’u* “noon”, hence, also “lunch” (MSA and all dialects use instead *ḡadā’u* for “lunch”, which is in turn the CA word for “*breakfast*”); *ḏawāḥī* “places or areas most exposed to the sun” (in MSA and all dialects “suburbs, outskirts”; sg. *ḏāḥiya-tu*), etc. JArām. *ṣḥy* “be thirsty” (NWSI II, 966), BHeb. *ṣḥh* “dry”, Arām. *ṣḥ* “be thirsty”, from “be dry” < “be sunny” (OT, 890): cf. CA *ḏāḥiya-tu*, said of the upper branches of a tree, “dry”, from “exposed to the sun” (nowadays “outskirts” above). All from a compound \**ḏW-*, as in CA *ḏā’a* “to shine, light”; *ḏau’u* “light”, and *MN*. A possible Egyp. cognate is *wḏ* “early dawn”.

5f) CA *wāḏaḥu*, with prefixed *w-*, “light (of the sun)” as in *Hadith* «*ṣūmū min wāḏaḥin ‘ilā wāḏaḥi*» (ML VI, 119) also “the light and whiteness”, esp. *of the morning* (LA, r. *wḏḥ*), *wāḏḥu* “milk”, so-called from “its whiteness” (Abu Ali Ḳalī, *Amālī* II, p. 194).

5g) CA *ḏiḥḥu* [ḏḥḥ] “the sun” (ṢHH I, 385f) also “sunshine, light of the sun” (LA, r. *ḏḥḥ*), BHeb. *ṣāḥaḥ* “to be sunny, bright”, Arām. *ṣḥḥ* “shimmer”, etc., see §2.12.24 above.

#### Comments I

It is necessary to go back to the trilateral [rwh] for two purposes: (1) to convince myself that the above-given analysis is correct, and (2) to add some important details.

When we say that *rawāḥu* is a near antonym of *ṣabāḥu* in a language so conservative and systematic as CA, we have to make the inevitable conclusion that only \**rW-* is the antonym of \**ṣab-* in the two triliterals, and that \**-ḥ-* is a proot common to both. The trilateral [ṣbh] is a compound consisting of at least two elements: a stem *ṣab-* and a proot \**-ḥ-* “sun”. Since \**raw-* denotes *to depart*, etc. above and is at the same time the antonym of *ṣab-*, then \**ṣab-* is bound to denote *to come or return*. Unfortunately, \**ṣab-* does not express this meaning in CA and other Semitic languages, and, in accordance with this fact, we have to admit that either the signification assigned to \**raw-* may be wrong or \**raw-* and \**ṣab-* are not originally antonyms. A deep consideration of this fact compels me to take into account the context in which they occur, i.e. *add to both the proot \*-ḥ- and re-examine both sentences*: [rwh] = setting of the sun, while [ṣbh] = rising of the sun. Accordingly, stem [ṣab] must denote “rise” (see below).

On a number of occasions in this research I have stressed the obvious fact that Semitic /ḏ/ and /ṣ/, like other consonants with identical or similar point of articulation, interchange positions with each other, and that in nearly all cases CA has preserved both forms in which the interchange occurs.

Accordingly, \**ṣab-* (of *ṣbh*) is from an earlier \**ṣaw-*, and this in turn is ultimately from \**ḏaw*, i.e. *ḏaw’u* “light”. This will make [ṣbh], [ṣwh], [ḏbh] variants of a compound word of \**ḏaw-* and \**-ḥ-*, and all, like *ḏḥw*, *ḏḥḥ*, etc. above, have in common

one single underlying semantic structure<sup>181</sup>. Let us see what these two new trilaterals denote.

CA [šwḥ ~ šyḥ] as in šauwaḥa, said of the sun, “to scorch, burn so as to alter in color, make the skin brown” also, said of upper parts of plants, “be dried up, be dry”, from be exposed to the sun; šāḥa “to give light (dawn)”; CVII ’inšāḥa, said of the moon, “to illumine, shine” (ŠHH I, 384), CA šaḥā, Eth. šḥy “be cloudless, serene”, Syr. šḥy “dry weather”, Mand. šhy “be thirsty, dry” (MD, 389), OffAram. šḥwh ~ šhwh “thirst”, etc. 5e above<sup>182</sup>, Chad.: LPe čō’ “dry up”, Masa soya, Mesme tcho’o, Banana so’amo id. (HSED, n. 451).

CA [ḏbḥ] as in ḏabaḥa “to scorch, burn the upper part of”; ḏabaḥa, said of the sun, “to make the skin brown, scorch, burn so as to alter in color” (ŠHH I, 385; LA)<sup>183</sup>

### Comments II

The last trilateral cited above also expresses “a kind of running involving rising and stretching the upper arm of a horse or camel”, which is definitely from ḏaba’a ~ ḏabaḥa (LA, r. ḏb’), a compound of \*ḏab- “rising, raising” and \*-’- “hand”. The original meaning of the compound is thus “upper arm”. For further information on [ḏab-], see §2.1.10, n. 7 above. If we shift the order of radicals forming the compound, we will get another compound [’ḏd] expressing the same meaning, i. e. “upper arm” (for ḏb’, also see ŠHH III, 1247).

With the discovery that \*ḏab- denotes “rise” (see also §2.11.42 above), one may object to the derivation of šabāḥu “morning, morning time” from \*šawāḥu < \*ḏawāḥu, and propose instead a compound \*ḏabāḥu denoting “rising + sun”. As will be shown below, there is no deep semantic difference between \*šab-, \*šaw-, \*ḏab-, and \*ḏaw-; all denote “rise”

i) Starting with \*šab-: BHeb. šābā(h) “to project, be prominent” also “to swell (of the belly)”; šābeh “swelling, swollen”; šabī “splendor” (OT, 880) = CA šaba’a “to emerge, rise, appear, as a star, moon”, and “to shine, be splendid” (LA; MA 227), CIV ’ašba’a as in Poet.

«wa ’ašba’a ’annaḡmu fī yaḇrā’i kāsiḡatin...» (LA).

<sup>181</sup> The usual interchange of /ḏ/ and /š/, on the one hand, and of /b/ and /m/, on the other hand, gives rise to a new trilateral [šmḥ] as in šamaḥa, said of the summer, i.e. *the sun of summer*, “be about to melt one’s brain from its intense heat”. The subject of the verb can be *the sun*, *mid-day*, or *summer* as in Poet. (Abu Zubaid Ṭā’ī):

«...šamaḥa-thā tahīratun ḡarrā’u»

Thu Rummah also says:

«’iḏā šamaḥa-tnā (’a)š šamsu kāna maḡīlunā...» (Al ’Ayn III, 128-129).

<sup>182</sup> As one should expect, the root also expresses “utter a sound” as in JAram. šwḥ “to shout” (NWSI II, 964), BHeb. šāwaḥ “to cry out, to shout for joy”, BAram. šwḥ id. (OT, 887), CA šāḥa “to shout, scream, cry out, call out”, Ug. šḥ “to shout”, Syr. šwḥ id.

<sup>183</sup> CA ḏabaḥa, said of hare/rabbit, black snake, owl, fox, “to make noise, cry out”; ḏabḥa-tu “a scream, a shout”, orig. “howl (fox)”, and has a variant pronunciation in /š-/. It is used *metaph.* by PIP Antarah to describe the “noise” produced by a horse as it runs which is neither *šahīl* nor *ḡamḡamah*.

The trilateral [šbʾ] (also šabā exists as a variant or vice-versa) is from \*ḏab- as in CIV ʾadabā “to rise”; ḏābī “one who rises, i.e. *lifting s.t. upward*”, both derivatives occur in this line (of Ruʾabah):

«...yuʾmiluhā (ʾa)ṭ ṭāhī wa yuḏbīhā (ʾa)ḏ ḏābī» (LA).

ii) It is to be noted that ḏabā, said of the sun or fire, “to scorch, burn so as to alter in color, make the skin brown” (ṢḤḤ VI, 2405) = ḏabaḥa above.

iii) CA ḏawā-tu “swelling (of the head)”; ḏawwa-tu “cippus, etc.” ~ ṣuwwa-tu id. (see §2.11.42 above). As one should expect, ḏauwa-tu expresses “tumult, uproar, loud outcry (of people)”, pl. ḏawḏāʾu, and also “dry” as in Syr., CA, Heb. ṣwy “dry land” (MD, 390).

### Comments III

There is still a hitherto unknown term for “the sun” in HS which is \*haʾ. The term is seen in Semitic in compound trilaterals, of which the simplest to recognize is CA *nihā* “mid-day”. The initial \*ni- here may be identical with \*ni- of CA *niṣfu* “half” = Ug. *nṣp* id. or, less likely, related to CA ʾinā “the whole day”, Egyp. in “today”, Chad.: Kilba ʾunya id., Tangale wini “evening time”, Ngizim wəna “day”, Nza wane “year”, Bachama wan-to id., Chad.: Bambala awin-co “month, moon” (HSED, n. 64, 131), Cush.: Bil. uwān “time, hour” (VPHS, 83, n. 39), Chad.: Tangale wini “evening time”, Ngizim wəna “day”, Nzangi wane “year” (HSED, n. 64; HSED, n. 132). Also belong here CA ʾanyu ~ ʾinwu “hour of the night”, ʾinā “daylight”, i.e. CA ʾān ~ ʾawān “right time, season”, Egyp. wnw-t “hour”, nw “time, moment”.

It is only in Egyp. where we find an independent root [hʾ] signifying “day, time, season” and as a vb “to burn, break into flame, heat, fire, warmth” (EHD I, 438-439). Like Semitic, Egyp. also preserved the proot in compounds as in rhī “evening” (EHD I, 420, 429), from raw- “depart, go, be removed, defaced” above and hí “sun”, and the orig. meaning was “the departing sun”. Other related forms are Egyp. [hrʾr], [hrw], [hwr] “day”, Coptic how id. (EHD I, 450; Hodge, 1975: 181), and perh. Chad.: Buduma yīrow “day”, Dangla ʾriyo “noon” (HSED, 262).

a) Egyp. hwr, hrʾr, etc. above correspond to Semitic [nhr] “daylight” as opposed to ʾnight; as in CA nahāru id. without any verbal form, BHeb. nəhara “daylight, light”; nəhar “to shine, be bright”, BAram., Syr., Samar. nhr “to shine, be bright” (OT, 654f), also Syr. nəhrā “daylight, shining”, BAram. nhr “brilliance” (Rosenthal, 1963: 90).

Semitic [nhr] is a compound comprising a proot \*na- perh. either “time” or see §3.11, n. 6 above, and a stem \*-hār- “daylight” = Egyp. hwr, hr above, which is a compound of [haʾ] “sun” and [-r] (may be “*belonging to haʾ*” or a *determiner*”). The first element may be present in CA *ma-hā*-tu fem. “sun” also “anything glitters or gives off light, like *stone, precious stone*, etc.”. The term is often used in pre-Islamic Poet. for “a wild ʾwhiteʾ cow, because of its whiteness and its resemblance to a pearl”. The word mahā-tu seems to be a compound of a proot \*m- different from any suffixed /m-/ we have seen so far. It is most likely a proot signifying “resembling, similar to”.

b) Proot \*hā- may also be present in some traditional trilaterals beginning with [bah-] as in CA bahāʾ “splendor, brilliance, radiance”; bāhī “shining, bright” also “empty”, from be clean, neat, elegant = BHeb. bohū “emptiness”, from \*bhh “be pure, clean”

(OT, 114), Amh. *bāha* “a kind of white stone”, Tham. *bh* “to call something” = CA *bāhā* “to boast”; *bahbaha*, by reduplication, “to roar, growl”. It should be stressed here that [ba] alone can express “splendor, light, illumination” as in Egyp. *b’-t id.*, etc. above.

**2.13.25** CA *baḳā* “to look at and wait for, to wait for and watch, to watch” as in *Hadith* (of Ibin Abbās): «*fa-baḳai-tu kaifa yuṣalli (’a)n nabiyy*», Aram. *bəḳā* “to examine”, Egyp. *b’ḳ* “to see, notice”, Chad.: Boghom *bak* “to look for”, Cush.: Som. *beek-* “to observe”, Oromo *beeka* “to know”, Ometo *biḳ* “to see”, Kaficho *beḳḳ-* “to know”, Anfila *beḳ-* “to see” (HSED, n. 201), etc. see §2.10.14, *Comments* I, n. f above.

1) The same proot can also take caus. prefix [d-], among others, as in BAram., Syr. *dwḳ* “to look around, keep a look out” (OT, 218), CA [dḳ], etc. see §2.10.14, *Comments* I, n. f above.

2) The same proot can also take suffixed /-r/, hence a new Semitic trilateral [bḳr] as in JAram., Mand., Nab. *bḳr* “to examine” (NWSI I, 187; MD, 68), BHeb. *bḳr* “to search into, inquire; examine”, Syr. *bḳr* “to examine, search” (OT, 153): CA *baḳara* as in *baḳara ’al ḥadīṯ* “open and uncover”.

3) The same ‘idea’ can also be expressed by [bḳš] as in Phoen., BHeb. *bḳš* “to search, look for” (NWSI I, 188; OT, 154), etc. CA also has *baḳala* “to appear”.

**2.13.26** OAram. *bḳ’t* “valley” (NWSI I, 187), BHeb. *biḳ’ā* “valley, plain”, BAram. *biḳ’ā*, Jp. *biḳ’etā*, Tal. *biḳtā* “plain” (DRS II, 79), Mand., Syr. *bḳ’t* “region” (MD, 62), CA *buḳ’-tu fem.* “low-lying land, plain, place” < CA *ḳā’ū* “low-lying land”.

The plural of CA *buḳ’a-tu* is *biḳā’u* ~ *buḳā’u*. It seems to me that *ḳā’u* is originally the pl. of *\*ḳa’u* “valley, low-lying land”, and that the form is related to *\*ḳa’-* “to sit down, lie down, fall down” (see §§2.4.7 & 2.7.7 above). Moreover, *ḳi’ānu*, another pl. form of *ḳā’u*, expresses “low-lying land holding water” = *niḳā’u*, the pl. of *naḳ’u* [r. nḳ’]. The word *naḳ’u* = *ḳā’u*, and one of its well known derivatives is *mustanḳa’u* “marsh, swamp”.

**2.13.27** CA *baḡam* II “group of people”; *baḡmu* “multitude of people” is a compound of proot [ba’] “people” and stem [gam] “many, plenty, multitude, etc.”.

**2.13.28** Akk. *baṣāru*, SA: Soq. *bider*, Shh. *beḏor* “to cut, tear” (DRS II, 78), BHeb. *bāṣar* “to cut”, in Syr. “to shorten, diminish” (OT, 150), CA *baṣara* “to cut into two distinct parts”, hence also “to behead”, Ge. *bāṣšālā* (/l ~ r/), “to tear in pieces”, Mand. *baṣir* “incomplete, small, cut off, subtracted” (MD, 49): PHS stem *\*b-* + stem *ṣar*, which expresses two contradictory meanings. It is ultimately derived from the same root in Assy. *maṣāru*, which expresses both “to divide” and its antonym “to band together”. For Assy. [mṣr] “to divide” (above) and for “to band together” (see above). see §§2.10.5-6 above.

**2.13.29** Akk. *barū* “to see, gaze upon”; *uṣabri* “cause to see”, CA *barhama*, *baršama* “to gaze upon”, etc. Ibn Sīdihi assumes that the real meaning of *barhama* is “gaze upon s.t. and find it unconvincing”; this would make it a direct derivative of *baraha* “to prove” +

perh. neg. /-m/. All are from [ba-] + [’ar or ra’] “see”: §2.14.2 above.

**2.13.30** Ug., BHeb. b’r “to burn”, Aram. bə’ār, Mand. bar id. = CA s’r (§2.2.56.3 above).

## 2.14 PHS PREFIXED /ʿ-/:

### *Compounds With Initial Proot [ʿaʿ]*

PHS had a syllable [ʿaʿ] expressing “great, chief, grand, noble, important, mighty, lofty, large, spacious, abundant” which is a genuine proot that has been preserved mostly in self-evident compounds in HS language divisions, esp. *in Egyp. and Semitic*.

1) A careful study of all roots beginning with /ʿ-/ reveals that some of them include a prefix /ʿa-/, which plainly signifies “great(ness) of size, power, rank, space, number, and so on”<sup>184</sup>. Some illustrative examples from CA are:

1a) ʿaθġalu “great or spacious of a container, e.g. *belly as a container of food*” and is equivalent in meaning to the superlative ʿal ʿa-θġalu “the greatest or biggest belly”: ʿa-θġalu adj. “big-bellied”, superlative ʿal ʿa-θġalu (For ‘*comparison of adj.*’, see §2.19 below).

1b) ʿaġsu “to grip tightly or seize firmly with the hand”, i.e. *of firm touch with the hand*: ġassa “touch with the hand”;

1c) ʿafiḵu “coming back frequently”, i.e. lit. *of much (fast) coming back*; ʿafaḵa “come back”: fāḵa (see §2.11.29 above).

1e) ʿaθaġa “be addicted to drinking”, *much of drinking*: θaġġa “pour water copiously”.

2) The same /ʿ-/ appears in Egyp. in many phrases as an independent proot<sup>185</sup>, e.g.

2a) ʿʿ r “great of mouth” (r = “mouth”), i.e. *boastful*,

2b) ʿʿ mw “great of water” (mw = “water”) = SL ʿāʿim “flooded with water”, hence also “swimming”: CA ʿāma “to swim, float”;

2c) ʿʿ n wd “director of storehouse” (wd = “storehouse, stable” = SL ʿūda “room”),

2d) ʿʿ yb “great of heart” (yb = “heart”), i.e. *proud, arrogant*.

2e) ʿʿ ḥprw “great of transformations”, i.e. *of many changes* (see §2.17.11 below).

2f) ʿ ms “first-born”: cf. EHD I, 107 (*ms* “give birth to” also “child, son”, pl. *msmsiu* = Sem. mθ “child”) = CA ʿa-mūsu “pregnant (she-camel)”: see §2.17.71 below.

2g) dʿ ʿt “the great boat, i.e. *boat great*” (dʿ “boat, ship”).

It seems that the proot can appear before or after the noun it modifies. However, its

<sup>184</sup> There are, however, some CA words whose /ʿ-/ expresses “small, little” as in ʿaḥanu “small idol” (LA), contrasting with waḥanu “big idol”, but in some old CA dialects waḥanu expresses “small idol” (LA, r. wθn). In such old dialects, it is probably left for ʿaḥanu to denote “big or great idol”.

Another example from CA in which proot [-ʿ] seems to express “small” is ġunduʿ signifies ‘a small grasshopper or ġundub’ (LA). Radical /-n-/ is inserted in both words for ease of pronunciation) < ġudġud “a kind of ġundub”. This example shows clearly that ġundub “grasshopper” is bigger than ġunduʿ.

<sup>185</sup> It can appear after the noun as in Egyp. ʿʿ per or per ʿʿ = Pharaoh (> CA firʿaun, farʿaun) = CA frʿ, Ug. prʿ, etc. “first” = CA ʿfr “the very first (of heat, of cold, of season)”.

natural position is after the noun. Some additional examples are:

- 2h) mw ‘ ‘ “great water, i.e. *flood*”,
- 2i) mw ḥ’i “rain water”,
- 2j) b’ ‘a “great soul” (b’ “soul”).

3) The proot /’-/, like any other proot or grammatical affix, became an inseparable part of the root in Egyp. as in all other HS languages. Some illustrative examples are:

3a) Egyp. ‘h “to raise up on high, to hang out in the high”: ḥ(i) “to be high, to rise (of the Nile)” (EHD I, 135, 525).

3b) ‘šd “a fat bird”: šd “a kind of bird, fat (geese)” (EHD I, 138, II 758).

3c) ‘ḥ-t “a large house or building”: ḥ-t “great house, temple”.

3d) ‘nd, from older ‘nḏ, expresses, according to one account, “few” (EG. 558) and to another “have or possess nothing” (EHD I, 127): nḏ “little, something small” (EHD I, 411). CA naḏḏu “little (of water)”: ‘anāšu “a few, a little”; ‘ušuwa-tu or ‘inšu-wa-tu “something, part, or piece remaining from a thing”. Two facts must be recognized:

- i) a sequence /’nḏ/ is impermissible,
- ii) initial /’-/ of CA [’nṣ] may also signify “ringlet of hair”: nuṣṣa-tu “hair near or by the forehead”, pl. nuṣašu (see §2.11.42, n. 2 & 3). This special proot /’-/ is seen in Egyp. /’/ “piece, member, limb” (EHD I, 106).

4) PHS [’-] also expresses “condition, state, means” as in Egyp. [’] and perh. “a sort of”. This particular proot has become an inseparable part of the root in HS languages. For example, HS [’yš] as in CA ‘āša “to live”; ‘aišu “means of living, e.g. *food*”; na’āša “enliven”, etc. see §2.11.15 above. This is a compound of /’a-/ and \*’ay-š- “existing, living, being” > “man”, etc. (see §2.14.6 below).

**2.14.1** CA [’ṭl] in ‘aiṭalu “tall”, [’ṭls] in ‘aṭallasu id., [’ṭbl] in ‘aiṭabūlu id., [’ṭd], [’ṭwd] in ‘aṭauwadu id., [’ṭṭ] in ‘aṭauwaṭu id. Also, according to Bin Faris (IV, 372), ‘alṭamīsu “pretty maid” is from ‘ayṭamīsu, this is in turn from ‘ayṭā’u, which is from [’ṭ] < \*ṭaw-, seen with l-ext. as in ṭawīlu “tall”; ṭūlu “tallness” also “length” (in CA ‘long’ and ‘tall’ are expressed by the same word: see §2.10.7 above), BHeb. ṭwl “to throw down at full length” (OT, 363), Sab. ṭl-m “length”; yḥṭln “extend, stretch” (SD, 154), with ṭ-ext.: as in CA ṭūṭu “tall”. The original meaning of ‘- + ṭ- is “great of tallness”.

1) An important fact should be noted: final -mīs in ‘alṭamīsu above is strangely a fem. stem and the whole word actually denotes “the greatest and prettiest female (of human being or she-camel), most perfect”. Is this stem a superlative ending (§2.19 below)? The word consists of [’a’], [ṭaW] and a stem m- + -ū- or (less likely) -ī- + -s, whose pl. form appears in Poet. as ‘atāmīsu, from ‘aṭāmīsu. This is the very same stem seen in ‘ayṭamūzu “the tallest and greatest + a feminine noun like *rock, she-camel*, etc.”<sup>186</sup>.

**2.14.2** Akk. ebūru, JAram. ‘ābūra’, Syr., Mand. ‘br, Heb. ‘əbūr “grain” (MD, 340),

<sup>186</sup> Another stem [-mis ~ -bis] appears in ‘ukāmīsu ~ ‘ukāmīšu ~ ‘ukābisu ~ ‘ukamīsu, etc. said of a fem. coll. noun like ‘iblu “camels” “a huge herd, being many, about 1000”. I don’t know whether this stem is variant of the above.



OffAram. 'bwr, Pun. 'b'r (from 'bwr) "crop; grain", also Pun. 'br "cereals, grain" (NWSI I, 822-823), orig. "*abundance of grain*": Akk. burru "cereal", CA burru "wheat, grain", Sab. brr "wheat", BHeb. bar, bār "corn, grain". The orig. meaning is "*abundant or large amount of grain*".

**2.14.3** CA 'aḏama "to blame, rebuke, revile" sounds much stronger than ḏamma "to censure, blame", Tham. ḏm "blame" (Branden, 1950: 512), Ug. tōmm "se conduire mal", SA: Hars. ḏem, Jib. ḏimm- "injurier", 'ḏmim "blâmer", etc. (DRS IV, 335). The orig. meaning of the compound is "*great of blame*".

**2.14.4** CA CII 'awwala, CIV 'a'wala "to wail, lament, grieve audibly"; 'awīlu "wailing, long and loud cry, lamenting" sounds much stronger than walwala "to wail, ululate"; wailu "woe", OAram. yllh "lamentation", OffAram. yll "to lament", Pun. yll "moaning" (NWSI I, 458), BHeb., Syr., BAram. yll "to wail, yell" (OT, 400), Chad.: Angas wāl, Chip wil "cry, sob", Sokoro olu "funeral song" (HSED, 526), All are from a PHS compound word consisting of [wū] as in Akk. ūya, wā(ya) "alas, woe", Ug. y, Heb. 'ōy, 'oyā, Hatra. wy "woe, alas", Syr., Mand. wāy, wāyā id. (DRS VI, 531), CA way, wāha ~ wāhan ~ 'uwāhu id., Tham. wh "infortune, malheur" (Branden, 1950: 513), SL wū "woe", and if a semivowel is to be added, it is wūw and not -y. The second element is ['al or \*-l] "sound, a cry".

To this PHS proot certainly belongs CA way, used to express "regret over an error, lost opportunity" as in the Koran: (وي كانه لا يفلح الكافرون), *Ah, the ungrateful succeed not* (28:82) and in the PIP of Antarah:

«wa laḡad šafā ḡalbī wa 'abra'a suḡmahu

ḡawlu ('a)l fawārisi way-ka 'antara 'aḡdimi» (ŠM, p. 255, L. 109).

As we have seen in §2.1.14.2, n. 1 & 2, under *Comments* above, Sem. [Wal] expresses "man, family". A combination of /'ā/ and /'al/ gives rise to a trilateral ['yl] ~ ['wl] orig. expressing "great/large family or great man": cf. CA 'ā'ila-tu. Moreover, the interchange of /' / and /h/ has given rise to a bound root \*hil, seen only in the compound 'āhil "king, monarch": see §2.5.10 above.

**2.14.5** CA 'anzaḡu "ill-naturted": naziḡu "reckless, insolent"; CVI tanāzaḡa "to insult, revile", Phoen., OffAram., JAram. nzḡ "to take offence, damage" (NWSI II, 724).

**2.14.6** 'aḡafu "leanness, emaciation"; 'iḡāfu adj. (Koran, 12: 43). To my understanding, the meaning of ['ḡf] is wholly based on [ḡf] as in ḡaffa "to dry up, desiccate"; n. ḡafāfu "drought", and ['a-] may signifies "condition or result (of drought)".

**2.14.7** Egyp. 'wg "to heat, to cook" (EHD I, 115): wg "be burned, to burn", CA waḡḡa, 'aḡḡa, etc. see §2.5.8 above.

**2.14.8** CA 'abhara-tu fem. ['bhr] "(female) combining beauty (of face) with fitness of the body and loftiness of characters (or good moral)" < bāhira-tu fem. "(female's beauty or charm) dazzling the eyes" as a vb bahara; bahara "to dazzle with intense light",

BHeb. *bāhīr* “brilliant, sparkling”; *hibhīr* “to clarify, explain, shine”; *baheret* “a brightness”, i.e. *a spot in the skin, for the most part white*, Aram.: Jp. *bahartā* “white spot in the skin”; *šabhar* “to shine, glorify”, Syr. *šabhar* “to glorify”, Eth. *bhr* “be bright, light; a light, luminary” (DRS II, 49; OT, 116).

**2.14.9** CA [‘dr I] in ‘*adaru* “big testicle”. Old Arab scholars tend to consider /‘-/ as variant of /’-/. LA states that it seems as if /’-/ were changed into /‘-/: cf. ‘*udra-tu* fem. “swollen testicle”, from a stem \**dur-* “testicle”, seen in the dual *dau-darā* (see §3.17.21 below). I have already illustrated the interchange of /’/ and /‘/ with examples on a number of occasions above and sorted out some cases which included proot [‘a’] (see, for example, §§2.11.15 & 2.2.22 above). The trilateral under discussion is one of such cases.

**2.14.10** CA [‘dr II] in ‘*udra-tu* “boldness and intrepidity”, from a stem \**dar-* “strong, etc.”: see §3.2.24, n. b above.

**2.14.11** CA [‘dr III] in ‘*adru* “copious rain”, lit. “abundance of rain”, from a stem \**dar-* as in *mi-drāru* “pouring forth copious rain” as in Poet. (Jarīr eulogizing his wife):

«...*hazamun* ‘ağššu wa *đīma-tun mi-drāru*».

**2.14.12** Egyp. ‘*hh* “night, darkness”: *hhw* “night, darkness” (EHD I, 135, 563).

**2.14.13** CA-OYem. ‘*afada* “put the feet close to each other and jump”: CA *fadda* “tread heavily on the ground”. The proot ‘a = *a kind of* or, more likely, *one*.

**2.14.14** Egyp. ‘*f* “be greedy, glutton”; ‘*f-t* “gluttony”; ‘*f* “gluttonous man, to be greedy”: ‘*f* “greedy, glutton man”; ‘*f-t* “greed, glutton” (EHD I, 5, 110, 119-120): see §2.11.68 above.

**2.14.15** Egyp. ‘*m* “to seize, to grasp, to clasp”: ‘*m* “to seize, to grasp”; ‘*mm* id.; ‘*mm-t* “fist, grasp” (EHD I, 6, 111).

**2.14.16** Phoen. ‘*p* “to fly” (NWSI II, 833), Ug. ‘*wp* id. (UG, 532), BHeb. ‘*ūp* “to fly”; *Hiph.* “make fly away”; ‘*ōp* “wing”, coll. “birds, fowl”, BAram. ‘*ōp* “bird, birds” (OT, 761), CA ‘*āfa* [‘yf] “to hover, fly”; \*‘*ā*fu “bird”. Egyp. preserved both the compound ‘*p* “to fly” and the stem *yp* “to make to fly”; *yp’p* “to fly” (EHD I, 42, 111).

1) The real proot underlying HS words is [pa-] “to fly” as in Egyp. *p* ~ *pí* ~ *pwí* id. (EHD I, 230, 234, 235). As we should always expect, ‘*voice*’ does not seem to have any phonemic force: comp. Egyp. *b’b* “to fly”, ‘*bb* id. (EHD I, 118, 203). Another example illustrating the same fact is *wb* “to open” ~ *wb* id.: *wpp* id., *wpí* “opener”; *wp r* “opening the mouth” (*r* = mouth) = ‘*b*’ ‘*wí* open the hands (‘*wí* “the two hands”), etc.

**2.14.17** Egyp. ‘*ḳ* “to feed” also “to give” < ‘*ḳ-t* “food”, CA *ḳūt* id., etc. see §2.9.27 above. To this proot also belong Egyp. ‘*ḳ* “god of food” = CA *ya’ūḳ* “worshipped idol,

deity”, where y- is a prefix (LA). It may belong here pre-Islamic CA ‘aḳḳa “to offer a sheep as a sacrifice to a deity, esp. *in return for the protection of one’s son and after seven days (?) of his birth*, etc.”. The term ‘aḳīḳa-tu also refers to the ‘food’ made from the slaughtered sheep and ‘given’ to charity and perh. also to the *act of eating* of that food.

**2.14.18** Egyp. ‘g’lty “chariot” (EHD I, 112), Phoen., Pun. ‘glt pl. “chariot” (NWSI II, 824), BHeb. ‘gl “ring; round”, ‘glh, BAram., Syr. ‘glh “any wheeled carriage, wagon”, CA ‘aḡala-tu fem. id., also “wheel” (OT, 749), etc. all are from a stem [gul] as in Akk. galālu “to roll”, BHeb., Aram., gll id., etc. (DRS III, 125): CA ḡalla-tu or ḡilla-tu “dung of goat and sheep, so-called after *its round shape*”, and by redupl.: OAram. glgl “wheel”, BHeb., Pun. glgl id., Akk. gulgullu “skull (from *its round shape*)”, Aram. glgl id., etc. (DRS II, 118), CA ḡulḡulu “bell, so-called from *its round shape*”. The orig. signification is “wheeled chariot or carriage”, a compound of [‘] “pole of a chariot” and gul “wheel”: Egyp. [‘] is from [‘] “arm, hand”.

**2.14.19** Egyp. ‘mḥ “a kind of stone” (EHD I, 111), orig. “stone of great value” < mḥ “a kind of stone, agate, stone for inlaying”.

**2.14.20** Egyp. ‘gsw “goat-hide” (EHD I, 140): gsw “hide, skin” (EHD II, 813). The word cannot be a compound of [‘] “goat” (as in Egyp. ‘-t id.) and [gsw] since it violates the Egyp. word order, which places ‘hide’ before ‘goat’. Its 1<sup>st</sup> element may be [‘] “a piece of” above.

**2.14.21** CA ‘aḡḡa “raise the voice, cry out (loudly)”: see §2.11.58 above.

## 2.15 PHS PREFIXED /r-/

### *Compounds With Initial Proot /r-/*

Proot /r/ is often easy to identify but difficult to determine its early morphological function in a vast number of roots. The reason is that it has a number of different origins and meanings. In some cases, it is a variant of /n- ~ l-/ or /n- ~ l-/ variant of it: comp. BHeb. rṭš “to smite, break in pieces”, BAram. “to break in pieces”, CA rṭs “to smite” ~ lṭs “to pound, break in pieces” with BHeb. nṭš “to smite, pound, break in pieces; thrust out, cast off” (All are from \*ṭas- SL ṭas “cast off, throw away, strike”; laṭas “to hit”: CA ṭassā-nu “fighting battle, war”), CA la’la’at ~ ra’ra’at “to glitter, one’s eyes (fem.)”, CA lbθ ~ rθ “to tarry, stay, linger”, lṣḳ ~ rṣḳ “to stick; glue”, riθda-tu ~ liθda-tu “large group of people dwelling in a place”, etc.

1) The interchange between /r/ and semivowels, esp. /w/, is by no means rare: comp. CA [kfr] in ‘iḳtafara ~ [kfy or kfw] in ‘iḳtafā “to track, follow the traces of”; wṣṣ ~ yṣṣ ~ rṣṣ “to look by stealth” (§2.6.13 above), razafa [rzf] ~ wazafa [wzf] = zaffa [zf] “to hasten” also “draw near” = ‘azifa [’zf] “draw near”; ‘āzifu “one who is in a hurry, in rush”; razmatu “a meal” ~ wazmatu, mazmatu “one meal a day” (LA); ‘awšamu ~ ‘aršamu (ŠHH V, 1933), ḥarāratu ~ ḥarāwatu “heat, temperature” (ŠHH VI, 2311), ‘afā [’fy/w] ~ ‘afar “dust, soil” (ŠHH VI); yāba-t ~ yaraba-t “disappear, set (of the sun)”; daykū’u ~ darḳū’u “hunger”; ḥāza ~ ḥaraza; CIV ‘a-ḥraza “to obtain, get”; [hw’] in ḥawwa’a = [hr’] in ḥarra’a “to frighten”, ḥāfa-tu fem. [ḥwf ~ ḥyf] ~ ḥarfu masc. “edge, side”, ‘ašāfa CIV of [šwf] ~ ‘ašrafā CIV of [šrf] “to overlook”, ra’iḳu ~ wa’iḳu “noise (or sound) of a horse stomach” (LA), and so forth. The interchange is not confined to CA; it is rather found in other Semitic languages. For example, CA dāsa “to tread with the feet, to tread under foot, to thresh” = Akk. dāšu “to tread under foot, crush”, BHeb. dwš “to to tread, crush” also “tread out grain, to thresh” (= CA drs below), BAram. dwš “to tread, trample upon” ~ CA darasa “to thresh, tread out grain” = Akk. darāšu ~ darāsu “to trample upon, crush”, duruššu “foundation”, BHeb. drš “to tread with the feet”, Syr. drš “to tread”, etc. It should be noted that we can substitute /’/ for either /-w-/ or /-r-/ in both Semitic triliters without any important change in meaning: CA da’asa “to tread heavily on”; mid’āsu “a well trodden road” as in the Poet. of Ru’bah:

«fī rasmi ’āṭārin wa mi-d’āsin da’aḳ» (Al ‘Ayn I, 223).

1a) Semitic dwš/d’s/d’š/drš and many other triliters and quadriliters are ultimately from a compound \*da’ “make, cause” and ‘aθ “foundation, basis” (§2.12.43 above). An older form of the compound is preserved in CA da’θu “treading (on the ground) heavily” (=da’su) as a vb da’aθa (= da’asa above), [d’θ] exists as variant in derivatives. The same two basic elements are also seen in daiyaθa “to tread, stamp with the foot” also “soften, relent, etc. by stamping”; mu-daiyaθu “well trodden road”. Another trilateral is [dmθ] as in damiθu, said of a man, “gentle, good-natured”; damθu pl. “plain”

from “soft or easy to tread on”: *damaθa* “to soften, to relent, mollify” (LA): see below.

1b) The term ‘*interchange*’ as used above is often misleading when it applies to /r-/ and /w/ or any other radical in initial or final position, since such radicals often add different shades of meaning to the word and, in many cases, they perform different grammatical functions. Some additional examples are:

i) Sab. w’d “legal claim, demand”, in CA “give a preach”, etc. (§2.12.10 above): Sab. r’d “command, issue a command”,

ii) CA and gen. Sem. wdm “bind, join together” (§2.12.16 above): CA rdm (§2.15.16 below), etc. See §2.12, n. 5d above.

1d) For what concerns roots in (1a) above, the following observations should be taken into account:

i) /’/ of [d’s/d’s̄] may result from its interchange with /’/,

ii) /w/ of [dwš] and /y/ of [dyθ] are also from earlier /’/,

iii) /m/ of [dmθ] is pp., added first to [’aθ]. Later, as /m-/ became inseparable from the root, caus. [da’] was prefixed, creating a new root [dmθ]. The trilateral \*m’θ has survived in [mwθ/myθ] (since a sequence \*m’θ does not exist) as in *maiθā’u* “soft land”, *maiyaθa* “soften, mollify”. One can suffix /-r/ to [dmθ] without changing the basic meaning: see §2.1.6.7, n. 1 above. A prefix /r-/ can form with an etymologically different [mθ] a compound [rmθ] as in §2.15.3 below.

2) Proot [r-], like [’a-], [da-], [ba-], etc. above, is seen in Egyp. as an independent word [yr(i)] in many of its occurrences, but as part of the root in all other sister languages. The proot has already been introduced and some of its grammatical functions partly discussed above in §§ 2.1.6.7, n. 6c & 2.11.6, n. 3 and under *Comments*. It signifies “to make, create, form, act, fashion, beget, pass the time” and marks the passive as “be made, created, etc.”. Some examples illustrating the proot from Egyp.<sup>187</sup> are:

2a) Egyp. yrí ḥr “to terrify”: ḥr “to terrify”,

2b) Egyp. yrí ḥm “to live with a wife”: ḥm-t “wife, woman”, CA ḥamā-t “mother-in-law”,

2c) Egyp. yrí b’k’-t “to become pregnant”,

2d) Egyp. yrí w’-t “to travel, to journey”: w’-t “way, road, journey” (w’t “to depart”, w’d “way, road”, etc.

2e) Egyp. yrí nhn “to renew one’s youth, act as a youth”, etc.

3) The proot is also used in Egyp. and CA to express ‘*genitive relation*, i.e. *belonging to*’ and ‘*agent noun*’, a fact has already been discussed in § 2.1.6.7 above. Such grammatical functions and many others can also be expressed in CA and other HS languages by [-y/] (see §2.6 above).

3a) Egyp. yrí-t t’ “belonging to the earth”,

3b) Egyp. yrí pt “belonging to the heaven, i.e. divine being”,

3c) Egyp. yrí ‘ ‘ “doorkeeper, porter”, etc.

The following examples are intended to illustrate compounds with initial [r-].

---

<sup>187</sup> For the examples and many others, see EHD I, 65-71.

2.15.1 It is as clear as sunshine that CA /r-/ in [rðl] (as in raðula “be low, mean”; raðīlu “low or bad person”) is a prefix added to [ðal] as in CA ðullu “abasement, humiliation, obsequiousness”; ðalīlu “humiliated, coward, obsequious”; ðalla “be low, to humble, debase oneself”, OArām. zlh “cheap” (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 3), BHeb. zālal “be abject, vile, despised”, in Syr. “be vile” (OT, 280), Sab. ðll “to bring low s.o.; surrender” (SD, 39).

The biliteral \*ðal- is also seen in some other trilaterals such as [nðl] as in CA naðlu [nðl] “coward”.

2.15.2 It is also equally clear and unquestionable that /r-/ in the following words is a prefix: JAram. rmš “evening” as in *špr w rmš* “morning and evening”; *l rmš* “in the evening” (NWSI II, 1078), Syr. rmš “evening”, Mand. ramša id.; ramšia “darkening, twilight” (MD, 421). The term for “evening” in Semitic is [mšy] and not \*rmš (see §2.10.13 above). The Arām. words are certainly cognate with CA [rms] as in *rawāmisu* pl. of *rāmisu* “birds flying *at night* and animals moving *at night*, anything moving *at night*”, while *špr* could be cognate with CA *sfr* as in *’asfara ’aš šabāḥ* “the morning unveils its brightness” (see §2.2.17 above).

Based on the discovery that Semitic [mšy or mšw] is a compound of \*mu- “time” and \*šW- “night, evening” as has already been shown in §2.10.13 above, we analyze [rmš] as a compound of \*ra- (meaning?: see below)<sup>188</sup>, \*-mu- “time (of)” and \*-su “night, evening”.

c) Joining \*ra- and \*su- together does not result in a compound \*ras- signifying, as we should expect, “moving or going at night”. It is only when we shift the order of radicals /r-s-/ we get the expected meaning, hence *sarā* “to run, move, or go at night”. Anything/person moving at night is called *sārī* (Al ‘ayn VII, 291); CIV *’asrā* as in the Koran (17: 1): (سبحان الذي أسرى بعبده ليلاً); n. *surā* as in the PIP of Imri’ Al Qais:

«faḡā’at ḡaṭūfa (’a)l mašyi haiyābata (’a)s *surā*  
yudāfi’u ruknāḥa kawā’ibu ’arba’ā» (DI, p. 131, 2).

PIP Labid says:

«fa bāta wa *’asrā* (’a)l ḡaumu ’āhira lailahim  
wa mā kāna waḡḡāfan biyairi mu’aṣṣari».

It is most likely that [ra-] is linguistically identical with [ra-] of *rāḡin*: see §3.1.6.7, n. 2 above.

2.15.3 It is equally evident that /r-/ in [rmθ] is a prefix<sup>189</sup>: CA *ramaθa* “to fix and wipe off s.t. with the hand”: *massa* ~ *maθa* “to touch with the hand”. The interchange of /s/ and /ṣ/ gives rise to \*maṣṣa “to touch”, seen in *ramaṣa* “to seek and touch, to look for and touch, to seek to touch”. For stem [maθ] & its variants, see §§2.12.34; 2.17.42, etc. below.

2.15.4 It is also as clear as sunshine that CA *razafa* “to hasten, to speed, to hurry” (ML

<sup>188</sup> Is final /-r/ here a proot signifying “go about”?

<sup>189</sup> Perh. a prep. “with”.

II, 388) is from [zaf] and for its ultimate origin, see §2.12.22 above.

**2.15.5** CA radasa "to thrust, to pierce with a spear" = nadasa id. (MA, 387): dassa "to insert".

**2.15.6** CA rattala "to hymn"; tarātīlu "hymns, songs of praise, esp. *to God*" < talā "to recite, to read (e.g. a letter, anything considered as sacred or official).

**2.15.7** CA radama I, said of fever, "to last, continue" < dāma id.

2.15.8 CA radama II "to close off, e.g. *an opening, entrance, bridge a gap*"; radmu "dam" (Koran: 18: 95) = Akk. na-rdamu "dam" (MD, 425): CA damama, said of a grave, "to close it off, make it level with the ground, to cover, bury". In SL radam, said of a hole that has already been dug out "make it level with the ground, i.e. *re-close* it off".

**2.15.9** CA rahada "to crush or pound severely or to excess" > hadda "to demolish, break".

**2.15.10** CA rahfu "soft, gentle, kind"; rahīfu "slim", etc. > hiffu "gentle, sweet, soft"; hafhāfu "slim".

**2.15.11** CA rukāmu "heaps": rakama "to heap" < kāma "to heap"; kauma-tu, fem., "heap", BHeb. kīmā "heap, cluster" (OT, 464), Chad.: Boghom kyaam "mountain" (HSED, n. 69). The stem is also seen with prefixed n- in [nkm]: see §2.11.26 above.

**2.15.12** CA ramada "to sharpen, wet (spearhead, arrowhead)": see §2.10.25, n. 1b above.

**2.15.13** Assyr. rapāšu "to be broad"; urappīš "to broaden, increase"; rapšu "wide-spreading" (King, 1898: 386), CA 'arfāšu "broad, large, big", *describing a man's beard or ears*: PHS stem [paš-] as in CA fašā "to spread", Assyr. pāšu "to increase", OAram. pšš "to enlarge", BHeb. pāšāh id.: comp. [rpš] with [npš] in §2.11.8 above.

**2.15.14** CA radaḥa "to spread out something on the ground in a way to make even with the ground": daḥā (Koran: 79: 30) "to spread, stretch".

**2.15.15** CA raḫafa "shudder or shake, as from *cold*": ḫafḫafa id.

**2.15.16** CA raḏama "to put things, esp. *stones*, atop of one another, to build with stone by placing each stone above the other"; raḏma-tu ~ riḏāmu "large rocks placed above one another" (Jamharah III, 751): comp. ruḡma-tu ~ riḡāmu "heaps of stones" (§2.7.10, n. a above).

SL uses laḏam for CA raḏam, and the difference in use between *laḏam* and *ḏamm* is

that the latter signifies “to join together, annex to”, while the former adds to this meaning, just like /l-/ in a large number of roots, “sticking closely, gluing”.

**2.15.17** Phoen., Pun. rp’ “to heal, cure”, OAram. rp’ “cure” (Rosenthal, AG, 14), OffAram. rp’ id., rp’h “healing”, EHeb. rpwy id. (NWSI II, 1081f), BHeb. rp’ “to heal, cure” also “to sew together, mend, repair; to quiet”, Eth. rf’ “to mend, repair” (OT, 990, 992), Sab. rf’ “to safeguard” (SD, 115), CA rafa’a “to mend, repair, calm down, soothe, make compatible”, also [rfy] “to mend, repair, calm down, etc.”

To my understanding, notions like ‘repair, mend, cure, heal’ are all from “restore or bring back to a former condition”. Two other roots express similar ideas: CA šafā, CIV ’ašfā id.; šifā’u “cure, remedy, restoration to health” (said of one who was ill or injured, hence *mustašfā* “hospital”) and ’ūfiya “be cured”; ta-’āfaya ~ ta-’āfā “to regain health”; ’āfiya-tu “health”: see §2.17.13 below.

**2.15.18** Phoen. rp’ “shade, ghost” (PG, 147): comp. CA fai’u “shade” (§2.24.15 above). Note that CA wārifu, said only of a shade, “umbrageous” is ultimately from \*fy- (see §2.12.15, esp. n. 2 above).

**2.15.19** OffAram. rms “to tread” (NWSI II, 1078), BHeb. rmś “to creep, crawl”, *a verb for the motion of smaller animals which creep along the ground or glide/drag themselves upon the ground* (OT, 983). The real CA cognate seems to be mašā “to walk, move, tread”; māšiya-tu, coll., mawāšī, pl. of the plur, “domestic animals” (sheep, cows, camels)<sup>190</sup>. It is, however, more common as a term for “sheep”, esp. in MSA. Sab. ms²y, ms²w “to go away”; v. imp. l-ms²w “drive, take along sacrificial animals” (SD, 87), Egyp. ms “to walk” (EHD I, 324). The same stem is also seen in HS [nmš] (see §3.11.52 above).

**2.15.20** CA rufātu “remnants of a dead body long after his death”, with no sg. form: rafata “to break into fragments, crumble” < fatta = rafata in meaning, Egyp. ftft “to crush” (EG, §274), BHeb. pat “a bit, crumb” (OT, 874) = CA futātu pl. id. I don’t see any relation between rufātu and rafata/fatta. The word seems to be related to CA *wafātu*, said only of a human being, “death”; ta-waffā “die” (see §§2.1.6.5.22, 2.11.29, n. 5c & 6b above, and 2.20.5, n. 2 & 2a below). In this case, initial [ru-] must be a proot for ‘human being’. The proot [ru] is seen in Egyp. r “man”; rt ~ rθ “mankind, men” = CA rutūtu pl. “magnates (of a town)”, sg. rattu.

**2.15.21** CA raġamu “oven” appears to be from a stem \*ġam- “to burn” since a root \*raġ- does not have anything to do with that meaning.

1) By shifting the first radical of [rġm] to final position, however, we get a trilateral [gmr] as Phoen. gmr, etc. “charcoal” (NWSI I, 226-227), CA [ġmr] in ġamru “embers”, pl. of the pl. ġamarā-tu fem., with ġamara-tu fem. sg. “ember”, the pl. of the pl. also

<sup>190</sup> A trilateral [rmś] exists in CA as in mi-rmāšu lit. “one who keeps on moving his eyes when he looks”: *rimšu* “eyelid”.



denotes “small stone”, since ‘*small stones*’ and ‘*embers*’ resemble each other in shape. To complete the pilgrimage, a Moslem has to pelt the Satan with *ġamarāt* = *small stones*. The ritual process is referred to as *raġmu* “stoning, pelting with stones”: cf. BHeb., Aram., etc. *rgm* “to stone; stone”, etc. (§2.7.10, n. a above). Note that BHeb. has a variant [*rgb*] “heap of stones” (OT, 84). This variant is seen in CA *ruġba-tu* “stones heaped together beside the trunk of a palm-tree to prop it”. I am not sure, however, that [*rgm*] and [*rgb*] are variants of one earlier form.

2) To complete the picture of shifting radicals, let us shift the first radical of [*rgm*] to second position. The resulting trilateral [*grm*], *as it stands* (i.e. with suffixed radical -m), expresses in CA *ġarīmu*, said of the dates, “dry”; *ġarmu* “hot” (LA): PHS stem [*gar*] “to burn, be hot, dry” (see §§2.2.4 & 3.4.16 above).

3) As a matter of fact, PHS has a stem [*gam-*] signifying “to burn something”, and perh. related to the root in CA *ġumā’u* “corpse” also “person, figure or shape of a man”. Let us suppose that this relation did indeed exist, then the signification of the word would have once been “to cremate (?)”, I suppose. There is, however, no historical fact tending to support it. It is most likely that \*g- of *ġumā’u* is a proot = *a sort of man* or *great man* see §2.17.83 below, and that there is no relation between [*gam*] and [*gam’*].

4) There is no doubt that PHS had a base \*gr-/rg- denoting such related notions as “mountain; tree” (see §2.11.77 above) and “stone”, and is seen in Semitic languages with various extensions.

4a) With prefixed radical w-: [*wgr*] as in BAram., Syr. *ygr* “heap of stones”, Sab. *wgr* “be stoned” (= CA *ruġima* id.), Ge. *wagara* id., Tna., Amh. *wäggära* “to hit with stone”; Amh. *wäḡər* “hill”, CA *waḡru* “shelter like a cave or cavern in a mountain”, ECA *wgr* “tombstone” (DRS VI, 495; OT, 374; SD, 158), OffAram., Nab. *wgr* “rock tomb, stela” (NWSI I, 296). This same meaning is also expressed by [*rgm*] above.

4b) We can also add a suffix like /-l/ and get a trilateral [*ġrl*] as in CA *ġaralu* ~ *ġarwalu* pl.(?) “stone, place in a mountain filled with small stones or with stones and trees”; *ġarila* “be stony” with *ġiryālu* “the red color” (Al ‘Ayn VI, 101; ML I, 445; LA), BHeb. *gōrāl* “small stone” (OT, 203). Is final /-l/ *a definite article* or *a diminutive suffix*? The same idea can also be expressed by infixing /-t-/ hence *ratā’iġu* [*rtġ*] “rocks so closely placed together” (MA, 161); *ritāġu* “a very narrow path that looks as if it were closed off from its narrowness” (LA), etc. see §2.7.9 above.

5) Still, by shifting the radicals of [*wgr*] above, we get Semitic \*rgm or \*rgw “red dye, purple” as in Ug. *argmn* “purple”, Assy. *argamannu* “red purple”, BHeb. *’rgmn* (King, 1898: 324), BAram., Palm., Syr. *’rgwn*, CA *’urguwānu* [*r. rġw*] “red purple” as in the PIP of Umar Bin Kalthum:

«ka’anna θiyābanā minnā wa minhum  
hudibina bi *’urġuwānin* ’aw ṭulīnā».

6) If we drop /’ar/ from Sem. *’argmn*, we still get [*gm*] “a type of stone” as in CA *ġumānu* pl. “pearl”.

7) To get an additional trilateral expressing the same notion, prefix \*t- to the proot \*rg-, hence CA [*trġ*] (§2.7.9 above).

8) It seems to me that Semitic \*rgm- ~ rgw- above is based on \*gw- as in BHeb. *gūnī* (colored, dyed) Guni = CA pers. name *Ġūn* or *Ġuwayn*. Besides, CA words for “color”

are also used as a family name; some are used as first name. BAram. gwn “to dye, color”, Syr. gwn “color” (OT, 185), in pre-Islamic and early Islamic poetry CA ġwn may express “black mixed with red, *as the color of sand-grouse*”, “pure red”, “blackish”, etc. The reason for this confusion may be due to the fact that the word also denotes “*setting sun*”, hence *the various colors it then spreads out*. In addition, CA gā’a-tu “gray and red, black mixed with redness”, ġuwa-tu “a brown color”, ġu’wa-tu ~ ġu’wa-tu, said only of a horse, “red blackish”. Related words are Chad.: Lame Pewe gwoi’, Lame ṅgwai, Zime gwo’ “stone” (HSED, n. 935).

**2.15.22** Oakk. [r’m I] “to love” (Gelb, 1961: 185). King (1898: 385) identifies Assy. rāmu “to love” with BHeb. rḥm, etc.<sup>191</sup> Suppose that the Akk. word is originally \*r’m rather than \*rḥm, then it has a cognate in Semitic languages Tham. rm “345esirer ardemment” (Branden, 1950: 518), CA *ra’ima*, which expresses, according to Jawhari (ṢHH V, 1926), “to love”, and according to LA (r. r’m), “to have tender feeling for someone (child/baby) and cling to or be inseparable from (and love)”; hence *ra’mu* “son”. A similar definition was given much earlier by Farāhīdi (Al ‘Ayn VIII, 295).

The trilateral may be from [’um] “mother”, *the symbol of love, and tenderness, and the one who stays very close to her children and family*: cf. CA ’amma “be close to and compatible with”.

**2.15.23** Semitic [r’m II] expresses “be high; rise, raise” as in BHeb. רָם [r’m] “be high” (OT, 953) = רָם [rwm] “to lift up oneself, be lifted up, be high” = Sab. [rym] “be high” also “heighten a wall” (SD, 120), Aram., Mand. [rwm] id. (MD, 430), Ug. [rwm] “be high” (UG. 533), Phoen., OffAram. rm “high, elevated”; OffAram. rmh “mountain” (NWSI II, 1077). As a vb, OAram., Edom., OffAram., JAram. rwm “to elevate” (NWSI II, 1063), BAram. [rwm] “be high; to raise up, to exalt” (Rosenthal, 1963: 95), Assy. rūmu “high, exalted” (King, 1898: 386), Pun. m-rm “height, elevated part” (NWSI II, 694).

In CA the trilateral [rym] connotes “be high” as in raymu, coll. “small mountain” and raiyama “accelerate”, i.e. “raise”, As for the trilateral [rwm], it expresses as in rāma “to betake oneself to, endeavor to reach or attain” and its object is usually ‘*something high, lofty*’ which may or may not be attainable in one’s lifetime; marāmu “goal; purpose”. The best sense of rāma is expressed by the 20<sup>th</sup> c. Egyptian poet Ahmad Shawḳi in this

<sup>191</sup> As in Sab. rḥm “be merciful; mercy”, OAram., OffAram., JAram., Palm., Pun. rḥm “mercy, affection, love”, etc. CA rḥm “be merciful; mercy, affection, love” also “womb”, hence “blood-relationship, relatives”. The trilateral is related to [ḥam] “be very close to, to love” as in CA ḥamīmu “very intimate, blood-relationship” also “one who is very close to you, you love him and he loves you” (Koran: 26: 101, 70: 10), ḥāma-tu “one’s household, i.e. *parents and children*”, hence ḥamā “to safeguard, protect, defend; protector”, Sab. ḥmy “to safeguard; protector” (SD, 69), Phoen. ḥmyt, OCan. ḥu-mi-tu, Moab. ḥmt, EHeb. ḥwmt “wall, fortress”, i.e. *structure that protects* as in CA ḥāmiya-tu (NWSI I, 381). Besides, ḥamu is the term for “father-in-law” in all Semitic languages and dialects as in Akk. emu, etc. All are related to the Egyp. compound in §2.15, n. 2b above.

verse of poetry:

«*rum*-ta (ʾa)l ʾulā lā taskuna (ʾa)l ʾaryāfī  
ʾinna (ʾa)l maḍla-ta fī (ʾa)l ḡurā mirāḡi».

The same meaning is expressed by PIP Zuhair Bin Abi Salma:

«...wa law *rāma* ʾasbāba (ʾa) s smāʾI bi sullami» (ŠM. P. 210, l. 50),

and PIP Imriʾ Al Qais in the following verse:

«wa bayḡatu ḡidrin lā *yurāmu* ḡibāʾuhā  
tamattaʾtu min lahwin biḡa yaira muʾḡalī» (DI, p. 12, L. 7).

PIP Adiyy Bin zayd also says:

«wa sāʾisu ʾamrin lam yasushu ʾabun lahu  
wa *rāʾimu* ʾasbābi (ʾa)llaḡī lam yuʾauwadi» (JAA, p. 395, L. 26).

a) The notion “high” is also expressed in CA by *warima* “to swell”, i.e. *grow high, rise above the surrounding*, hence *warima*, said of a plant, lit. “to grow fat and tall”; *muwarramu* “swollen, bulky (i.e. extremely large + tall)”, connected by Albright (JAOS 47, 1927: 209, n. 13) with Egyp. *wrm* “inundation”; *wrm-y-t* “swelling”, Copt. *wrm* “to swell, rise”. In my view, Egyp. *wrm* is actually *wrmw* (EHD I, 174), a compound of *wr* “much, great, great size, very” (EHD I, 170; EG, 561) and *mw* “water”: Chad.: *Ankwe warr* “strength”, Gera *wur-* “surpass” (HSED, n. 2529) (EG, 568; EHD I, 293).

The major problem I have encountered in the analysis of such words is that both \**rW-* and \**-ʾm-* express similar meanings: cf. for the notion “*be high*” as expressed by BHeb., Ug., etc. above: CA *ʾamma* “be before all in rank”, i.e. *be the highest in rank*, hence *ʾimāmu* “leader or chief of people” and *ʾammu* “flag”, so-called because the army follows it (also *rāya-* id.), Akk. *umm* “maître, chef de travaux”, Eth.: Amh. *əmm* “le prêtre qui règle le service à l’église” (DRS I, 23).

For the notion “betake oneself to, etc.”: cf. CA *ʾamma* “to betake oneself to, go to, come to, to head to”, Saf. *wm* “diriger ses pas”, Eth.: Te. *ʾammāmā* “aller dans une direction, résoudre”, in Tna. “avancer” (DRS I, 23), Cush. *ʾim(t)* “to come”, Egyp. *my ~ ym* id. (RPAA, n. 570; EHD I, 48).

To sum up, the form *rʾm/rwm/rym* is a compound of two proots [r-] and [Wm]. To proot [Wm] a prefix /t-/ can be added to create a new triliteral as in CA *taiyama* “to be in ardent love, to be enslaved by ardent love, be enthralled”; *mutaiyamun* with prep. *bi* = “be enthralled by (e.g. a woman)”. An old pers. name *Taymu ḡāhi* = ‘Abdu ḡāhi = “Slave of God”. It seems to me that \**t-* was added to \**ʾm-* twice; one time to \**ʾm-* “mother; love” and another to \**ʾama* “bondman, slave”, survives in *ʾama-tu* fem. “bondwoman, female slave”, Sab. *ʾmt* fem. id. (Beeston, SD, 5), BHeb., BAram. *ʾmh* “maid-servant, female slave” (OT, 63), etc.

**2.15.24** BHeb. *rāšam* “to write down, to record”, BAram. *ršm* “to write” (OT, 998), OffAram. *rwšm* “(slave) mark” (NWSI II, 1065), Tham. *ršm-t* “mark” (Branden, 1950: 518), CA *rašama* “to write”, with *rasama* “to represent in a picture, make a picture of; mark, impression” = *wasama* = *wašama*, etc. (see §§2.2.48, n. 2d & 2.12.36 above): CA *wašā* “to embroider, decorate, embellish (with different colors or with different colored threads)”; šiyahu sg., šiy-ātu pl. “a distinctive color, a colored spot (e.g. on an animal’s hide) different from its hide’s color”, which may be considered as ‘blemish’ (cf. the

Koran 2: 71). The stem waš- is seen in compounds (§2.10.15, n. 3, under *Comments* above).

a) The interchange of /m/ and /b/ and shifting of root radicals enrich the language with additional trilaterals like 'a-rbaš ~ 'a-braš ~ 'a-rmaš adj. “speckled, spotted”, of these only 'a-braš, n. baraš is still widely used. With prefixed n-: namaš “very small brown and black freckles on the skin” (in SL the freckles are *brown*) and našmu, a type of *namaš*.

According to Tha‘ālibi (FL, p. 89), *naḳṣu* = *engrave, make colored marks, inscribe on wall, raḳṣu on paper, wašyu on clothing or garment, wašmu on hand, wasmu on hide or skin, rašmu on wheat and barley*, i.e. *you seal the sacks as you finish threshing crops*. Of these, the first term *naḳṣu* is actually used *to engrave, inscribe on stone, rock, and bone*. The use of ‘*wall*’ should only mean ‘*stone of a wall*’. Another set of roots having to do with “mark, write, marked with different colors, speckle, etc.” are CA *rḳm*, *brḳš*, *rḳt*, *pḳt*, *rḳt*, *nḳt*, *rḳš*, etc.

**2.15.25** Egyp. *rmn* “inactivity, idleness” (EHD I, 425) = SL *rummi*, adj., said of a man, “doing nothing and moving nowhere, indolent, inactive”, hence *disabled*, < CA CIV ‘aramma “be still, without movement (i.e. = ساكن *sākin*), be silent”. This is not the same trilateral seen in Egyp. *rmn* “to fall” = CA CVIII ‘irtama “be fallen”; *ramā* “to throw down, cast”, BHeb. *rāmā*, etc. gen. Sem. “to cast, throw”. It is rather from [mn] “stay, remain” and [r-] is a prep.: comp. Egyp. *r mn m* “remain in” (EG: §180).

**2.15.26** CA *rašafa* “to sip water with the two lips”: CA *šafa-tu* fem. “lip”, which can be made a vb: *šaffa* “to sip water (with the two lips)”, Ug. *špt*, etc. gen. Sem. “lip”. CA *arch. raffa* “to sip”<sup>192</sup>. As a noun, CA *rašfu* pl. > *rašfa-tu* sg. “a sip”.

**2.15.27** CA *rāba* “become exhausted, tired out” may correspond to Egyp. *yri ybw* “to make a stoppage, i.e. *to cease*”: see §2.2.3 above.

2.15.28 BHeb. *rdp* “to pursue, persecute, hunt” (Ryder, 1974: 116), CA *radafa* “to follow”, Mand. *rdp* “to harry, persecute, press after, drive away, drive off”, Sab., *rdf*, JAram., Syr. *rdp id.* (MD, 425): PHS stem [dap] (see §2.4.14 above).

### 2.15.29 Infixes /-r-/

a) Medial /-r-/ is an infix in large numbers of Hamito-Semitic roots, esp. *strong roots*. We have already seen in §2.11.8 above that [γaz] signifies “prick, sting (with a needle)” ~ *nayaza id.* One can insert /-r-/ in [γaz] and create a new trilateral expressing an identical meaning. In keeping with the same root, we have also seen that [nγz] and [nhz] express the same meaning. You can also insert an /-r-/ in [nhz] after dropping prefixed

<sup>192</sup> Another etymologically different *raffa* signifies in CA “to flutter (bird)”; *raffu* “group of birds flying together”. The reduplicated *raffafa* expresses “to flap the wings, flutter”. As in many similar cases, changing the order of [raf] to [far] does not affect the basic meaning (see §3.3.13, n. 1 above). For proot [paʾ] or [paw] “fly”, see §2.14.16 above.

/n-/ and get a new root [hrz] as in *haraza* “to bore, pierce” with *mi-hraz* inst. “awl”.

b) Another example is CA *ḥarraḏa* “to instigate, incite, urge (s.o. to do s.t. *evil*)” < *ḥadda* (see §2.11.41 above) = *ḥaṯṯa* id.

Similarly, *ʾaḡaḡa*, *ʾaḡḡa* “to flame up a fire, burn” (see §2.5.8 above) > *ʾarraḡa* id., *šamḡa* or *šamraḡa* “to sew”, and *zaḡḡa* *with a spear* = *zaraḡa* *with a spear* “to pierce or thrust with a spear”, and so forth.

c) Take, for example, Semitic group of roots beginning with [pr-] as in [prḵ], [prḡ], [prḏ], [prš], etc. see §2.1.9.4 above. To my understanding, CA [paḵ-] alone = “to separate”, Egyp. *pḵ* “part, share” (EHD I, 252), CA [pag-] “widen”, from “to divide” as in Egyp. *pg* id. from *pg* “piece, part” (EHD I, 252): see §2.8.18, n. 1 & 2 above. The basic meaning of [prḏ] is “make an opening”, this has definitely developed from [pḏ] lit. “make an opening in the hymen” as in CA *fadda*, *ʾiftadda* id, *ʾinfadda* CVII, said of a gathering of people, “be dispersed”, of anything “be opened”, Egyp. *pḏ* “to spread out” (EHD I, 256), etc. An additional root to be dealt with for illustration is [prḏ]. I have chosen this trilateral because its final /-d/ is from /-ḏ/, and the change is certainly due to *seq. const.*, since \**prḏ* is not a phonotactic possibility: cf. CA *faḏḏu* “one” (see §2.19.3 below). All such traditional roots, together with those beginning with [pl-] plus hundreds others, are based on [paʾ]: §§2.8.17-18 above.

e) It is only with this understanding of the status of medial /-r-/ in Hamito-Semitic, we can solve what may look like ‘*unsolvable puzzle*’ as the origins of HS [šrb] and [šrb], etc. in §2.2.50 above. For their origins, see §2.17.34 below.

f) It is quite difficult to determine whether /-r-/ is an infix, variant of a semivowel, or proot with certainty without a deep understanding of all HS stock of traditional root with medial /-r-/. For example, /-r-/ of CA *ʾaraḵ* “sweat” includes a proot /-r-/, and the word consists of proot [ʾa] “abundant” (see §3.14 above) + a stem [raḵ] (see §2.10.34 above).

## 2.16 PHS PREFIXED /ħ-/

### Compounds With Initial Proot /ħaW/

Apart from few exceptions out of about 200 roots in SL beginning with /ħ-/ , i.e. *orig.* [\*ħaw or less likely \*ħa’], but about 400 in CA, with thousands of derivatives in CA, to me a word with initial /ħ-/ leaves the impression in most cases that its signification is “*bad, shameful, wrong, false, violent, unfavorable (characteristic, shape, action, state, result, term, etc.)*”. There are, however, numbers of exceptions. Let us gain some deep insights into the underlying semantic structures of some of such exceptions.

1) Among the exceptions is [hmn] as in CA *hammana* “to guess, suppose”. To most, if not all speakers of modern Arabic, the surface meaning does not appear to involve any negative connotation. The deep meaning, however, implies *a kind of judgment lacking sufficient information*, and is wholly based, as Farāhīdi (Al ‘Ayn IV, 280) puts it, on *delusion*. It is thus “a wrong conception, false thinking”. Accordingly, the triliteral is a compound of \*ħ- “empty, void” and a stem \*man- “knowledge, thinking” > “to know, think, remember” as in Akk. *manû* “to reckon, recite” (AG, 87), Egyp. *mn* “calculation”; *mnw* “monument” (EHD I, 297, 298), CA *manna* “to reckon, count, recite, invent, wish”, Cush.: Som. *man* “mind”, Chad.: Sura, Angas, Ankwe *man* “to know”, Maha *manayo*, Montol *man id.*, Tal *āman id.*, Lame *man* “to understand, analyze” (HSED, n. 1721).

One may object to the above analysis of [hmn] and propose instead a stem [ham] “to think, think out a matter” (as in Egyp. *hmt id.*) plus \*-n. I don’t see any profound difference between [hmn] and [hmt]; both are based on [-m-] “to know” (§§2.3.7-8 above). A third kindred is seen in Egyp. *hmw* “to know”.

2) A similar example with deceptive surface signification is [hr] in Akk. “water-course” also “moat”, CA *hrr*, etc. see §2.1.14.1, n. 3k under *Comments I* above, which is derived from “making noise; gurgling; annoying noise” > “snoring”.

3) Moreover, Semitic [hrš] as signifying “gold” (in Akk. *hurāšu*, Phoen., Pun. *hrš*, etc. *id.*, CA *huršu* “bracelet, earring, or ornament made of gold”, etc.) is a comparatively late development whose coinage coincides historically with the discovery of *gold*. However, the triliteral [hrš] expresses in Semitic a number of unrelated meanings, one of which is expressed by CA *haraša* “lie, fabricates lies, surmise, conjecture, assess”; *harrāšu* “liar”, derived, according to LA, from “to make a judgment about something without having knowledge of or being sure of”, hence “lie”, and is best expressed by the following verse of Poet. (Abu Tammām):

«*ta-ħarušan wa ’aħādīθan mulaffaḡatan... ».*

Sab. *hrš* “make an assessment; assessment, valuation” (SD, 62).

Another meaning is expressed by CA *harišu* lit. “a large basin or pond (opening into a river) into which the water bursts forth and then comes back to the river”, which appears to be from \*ħar- above plus \*-š- from earlier \*-ḏ- “water” (§2.17.8 above) = OAram., OffAram., Pun. *hrš* “moat, canal” (NWSI I, 406), etc.

4) An additional example may be Sab. hlw ~ hly “to save, release, deliver s.o. from s.t.” (SD, 60) = BHeb. caus. h-hl “to set free” (OT, 317), CA CIV ’ahlā, said of a prisoner, captive “to release, set free”, said of a building, place, “to evacuate”; CII hallā “to leave, let, abandon”; hālī “empty”. The underlying meaning of the trilateral is ‘empty’, connoting “desolation, loneliness”.

5) The trilateral [hlw, hly] just mentioned above, like any other root in Semitic, comprises a number of different proots, with each expressing a special meaning. One of such meanings is expressed by CA halā “passed away (only in the context of time)” as in the Koran: (وما محمد إلا رسول قد خلت من قبله الرسل) , *And Muḥammadu is not but an apostle, (other) apostles have already passed away prior to him* (3: 143), (’a)l ḡurūnun (’a)l hāliya-tu “the elapsed centuries”, etc. To my understanding, the proot \*-l- here is linguistically identical with \*-l- “past, afore” (see §2.17.15 below).

Another such meanings is denoted by CA CVIII ’ihlā’u “privacy” (= ’infirādu id., from fardu “single, unique, one”, Sab. frd “uniquely, alone”). Moreover, when both words are preceded by prep. ’alā “on”, they signify “privately, when alone” just like ’alā ḡida- id. (for ḡida- “one, alone”, see §2.12.18 above); CX ’istahlā “be alone (with s.o.)” = ’istafrada. For this \*-l-, see my comments on [r. hlḡ] in §2.16.14 below.

5) In some cases, I can confidently tell that initial \*h- is a proot. For example, CA ḡaniṡu adj. (more common in MSA and all dialects as *mu-ḡannaṡu* adj.) “effeminate” is from \*h- and ’unṡa “female”, and CA ḡaḡala “to disappoint, forsake”; maḡḡūlu “forsaken” = BHeb. ḡādēl “ceasing to be, frail” as a verb “to leave off, cease, to forsake, desert” (OT, 296-297), comprises \*h- and \*ḡal- “to humiliate, humble, abase” (see §3.15.1 above).

6) In some other cases, however, I have no way of knowing whether \*h- is an autonomous proot or an integral part of a biradical proot as, for example, Semitic [ḡmš] “five”, [ḡtn] “brother/son-in-law”, [ḡdr] “be green, verdant”, [ḡym] “tent”, [ḡay] “good”, and so forth. Nevertheless, I believe that [ḡaW]<sup>193</sup>, though never [ḡay], was a grammatical prefix in many HS roots, and that this fact can be inferred from the type of meanings expressed by roots beginning with it. We have already seen many of such roots above (§§2.1.9, n. 11 & 2.12, etc.).

7) There is some evidence suggesting the previous existence of a proot \*ḡw- connoting “empty or void”. As an adjective, ‘empty’ describes that which has nothing in it or on it, and applies to what is without contents:

a. *empty village, town, ground, city or building = uninhabited, having no people living in it, which extends to desolation, ruin, destruction;*

b. *empty headed = lacking intelligence, sense or discretion = foolish, insane, disoriented, scatterbrained;*

c. *empty may modify heart = weak, faint, afraid, etc.;*

d. *empty can modify morality or the right conduct = wickedness, malice, disgrace, deceive;*

e. *empty stomach = hunger*, which often extends to ‘wish, desire’ (cf. CA ryb “to wish, desire” = Ug. ryb “be hungry”, BHeb. r’b “be hungry; hunger, famine”): comp.

<sup>193</sup> -\*W- is from an orig. /-w/, which is usu. drops in compounds.

CA *haw* “hunger”), orig. ‘empty’, *hawbu* “hunger”, etc.

f. *empty* (of hope, purpose) = *despair, fail*;

g. *empty womb* = *give birth to*, said of a woman: cf. CA *haw-t* = lit. *give birth to*, Egyp. *wh*’ “to have a miscarriage, let fall” (EHD I, 190).

h. *make s.th. or a place empty of* = *kidnap, plunder, steal* (cf. CA CVIII *’ihtawā* “kidnap” = CVIII *’ihtatāfa* id. It also expresses, together with *’ihtāta* ~ *’ihtadafa* “take for oneself”).

i. *empty space* (or emptiness) *in the ground, in a cloud, in a trunk of tree, in a wall, between earth and sky*, etc. = *hole* > *perforate, bore*, and so on. If my view is correct, all such meanings are bound to be expressed by compound trilaterals and quadrilaterals having /hw-/ as their first element.

The proot *haW-* has been preserved in CA as in *hawā* “be empty, void, be destroyed, demolished”; *hawīyatu*, said of a house, “being in a ruined state” as in the Koran: (خاوية) *فتلك بيوتهم* and in the PIP of Khansā’:

«*kāna ’abū ḥassāna ’aršan hawā...*».

Sab. *hwy* “make s.t. void” (SD, 64).

8) Our decision on whether the meaning of a given word with initial /h-/ is or is not in affinity with any of the meanings connoted by ‘empty’ above, should only be made after a close study of the root and its entire derivatives in related languages. For example, there is nothing *wrong, ungraceful, bad*, etc. with the surface idea “to scoop, draw water” as expressed by Akk. *habū*. A careful study of the underlying concept from which it is derived may soon change our view. It appears that the problem lies only in the ‘*kind of water being scooped*’, and not with ‘*scoop, draw water*’ as a verb: cf. Egyp. *hb* expresses “marsh, swamp” and so it does CA *hubba-tu*, etc. see trilaterals beginning with [hb-] below. When one walks in shallow water, the noises or sounds produced by the water is called in SL *habhabē*<sup>194</sup>. The term also refers to this particular type of walking = Egyp. *hb* “to steep in water” and also “to dance, do gymnastic feats” = CA *habba* “to amble, as do horses and other animals”.

**2.16.1** Akk. *habālu* “to destroy”, Syr. *ḥbl* id., BHeb. *ḥbl* “to act corruptly; destroy, ruin” (Ryder, 1974: 110), Sab. *hbl* “ruin” (SD, 58), CA *hbl* “madness, insanity; to destroy, damage, drive mad, confound, fluster”, OffAram., JAram. *ḥbl* “to ruin, damage” (NWSI I, 344)<sup>195</sup>.

**2.16.2** Assy. *habātu* “to plunder”; *hubtu* “booty, captives” (King, 1898: 916), in Akk. “to rub, plunder”; *habbatu* “bandit, robber” (AG, 73), Ug. *hbt* “to plunder” (UG, 535).

<sup>194</sup> Comp. CA *habaḡu* “the noise produced by the vagina in a sexual intercourse”.

<sup>195</sup> A traditional derivative of [hbl] is CA *mahbūlu* “empty-minded” (cf. *bālu* “mind”: read the last sentence below) = BHeb. *ḥbl* “to pervert, to perverse, corrupt”, BAram., Syr. *ḥbl* “to act corruptly”; BAram. *ḥabūle(h)* “evil deed, crime” (OT, 291), Ge. *ḥabālā* “to act corruptly or viciously”, Tna. *ḥabālā* “to cheat”, Amh. *abbālā* “to lie, cheat”, Har. *ḥibābāla* “to coax, entice” (HED, 79). This derivative should be studied in connection with *mahbūlu* [hbl] “empty-minded”.



a) The idea expressed by [hbt] is also expressed by [h̥tp], i.e. *by shifting the 2<sup>nd</sup> radical to final position*. As for the change of /-t/ into /-ṭ-/ and of /-b-/ into /-p/, they are a natural result of the first change since it is difficult to pronounce \*h̥tb and \*h̥tp: BHeb., Aram. h̥tp “make captive, catch, seize” (OT, 308), Palm. h̥tp “to plunder” (NWSI I, 364), CA h̥ṭf “to kidnap, abduct, snatch away” = Egyp. h̥wtf “to rob, spoil” (EHD I, 471) ~ h̥wdf “to steal” (EHD I, 474).

b) The same idea can also be expressed in CA by hāta “kidnap, plunder, steal” as *a wolf does with a sheep, an eagle with its prey*, etc. The most commonly used trilateral that applies to ‘wolf’, however, is hatala, i.e. *to deceive (a prey) by hiding oneself or moving very slowly and in concealment (make the surrounding appears as empty) + steal or take away*, which is apparently from \*hwtl, a compound of three proots: \*haw “emptiness” + -t- + -l- (perh. *swift*).

c) CA hawā, said of anything as object, “to kidnap, snatch away”, i.e. *make the place where the object was ‘empty’*, hence CVIII ’ihtawā ~ ’ihtāta [r, hwt], ’ihtadafa [r. h̥df], ’ihtaṭafa id.

**2.16.3** CA h̥bθ “be wicked, malicious, bad” > h̥nbθ “blamed, censured”.

**2.16.4** CA hibbu “deception + maliciousness, i.e. *h̥bθ above + deception*”, Egyp. hb “to deceive, defraud”. In addition, Akk. habbu “hole”, Berb.: Izy ahbu id. (HSED, n. 1363) = CA hubbu “bottom of a valley (+ obscure)” ~ habtu “low-lying and obscure land” also “deep valley”.

It seems that HS \*hbW ~ hpW “hide” originally involved a type of ‘malicious and rancorous act’: OCan. h̥b’ “to conceal” (NWSI II, 343), BHeb. h̥b’ ~ h̥bh “to conceal, hide”, Eth. h̥b’, CA haba’a id. (OT, 290), Sab. h̥b’ “to hide, conceal” (SD, 58), etc.

BHeb. h̥p’ “to cover”, h̥ph “to cover, to veil, e.g. *the head, the face*”, in Syr. h̥py id. (OT, 333-334), CA h̥afā “to hide, conceal; to veil”, OffAram. h̥py “covering” (NWSI I, 394), Eth.: Amh. əffəya “a cover”, Har. uffā “cover for holes”, En., Gt. efä(m) “to cover with lid”, Cush.: Ga. ufa “a cover”, Kam., Qab. iffi-ššo “to cover” (HED, 20), Egyp. h̥p “to hide, be hidden, to disappear”; h̥ph̥p “to hide”; h̥pw “hidden places, hiding-places, caves” (EHD I, 477) ~ h̥wp “to hide, to conceal” (EHD I, 470) ~ h̥’p id. (463), s-h̥’p “to hide, conceal, clothe” (EHD II, 682), h̥’b “fraud, guile, moral obliquity, deceit”, etc., Chad.: Tangale op̥e “to close”, Mokilko ’ipp- “to close, cover” (HSED, n. 1237).

**2.16.5** CA h̥bt expresses two root meanings: “hide, conceal” and this is from [h̥b] below, and “bad, contemptible, corrupt”, as well as “humble” (Koran 11: 23, 32: 54, 22: 34), which is from [h̥b] or a variant of [h̥bθ].

**2.16.6** DAram. h̥bš “be confused, disoriented” (NWSI I, 345), CA habaša “make a mess of, mix confusedly”, SL habbaš = hallaṭ (§2.16.15 below), said of speech, “speak confusedly”, i.e. *mix ideas or words confusedly*.

**2.16.7** OSA h̥bt “to smite, raid” as n. “waste, scraps”, Aram. h̥ebaṭ “to strike” (Stehle, JAOS 60, 1940: 516), Sab. h̥bt “to beat, defeat enemy” also “to suffer from epidemic

sickness”; ḥbṭn “type of epidemic” (SD, 58), BHeb. ḥbṭ “to beat off or out with a stick or club, beat off apples or olives from a tree, beat out grain with a stick or flail” (OT, 291) = CA ḥabaṭa “to beat off fruits from a tree”; miḥbaṭa-tu inst. = *a stick or club used for this purpose*. In *Hadith*, this action is forbidden (LA, r. ḥbṭ); ḥubāṭu, said of a person, “haunted by the Satan, being harmed and spoiled by the Satan’s touch”, in the Koran: (الذي يتخبطه الشيطان من المس), *whom the Satan has confounded with his touch* (2: 275); ḥibāṭu “distinctive mark in the thigh or the face”; CV taḥabbaṭa “to grope about awkwardly”. Egyp. ḥbṭ “to loathe, dislike; evildoer, horror; disgraceful or terrible things” (EHD I, 541).

For the signification “to strike”: CA ḥabaṭa “to strike, tread on”, with emphasis on the noise produced by a stroke or, more precisely, by the foot as it beats the ground, as in the PIP of Ṭarfah:

«*yaḥbiṭu* (’a)l ’arḍa biṣummin wuḥuḥin...».

For the signification ‘*waste, scraps*’ in OSA: CA ḥibṭa-tu “little of anything remaining in a place”, as *water in a basin, food in a dish*, etc.

**2.16.8** Sab. ḥd’ “damage, be lamed (foot)”; mḥd’ “falsification of text” (SD, 58-59), CA ḥada’a “to deceive, delude”. It is most amazing to find that CA mi-ḥda’u inst. “bedroom” (usu. *of husband and wife*) is derived from this root.

**2.16.9** CA ḥdm “servant”, Sab. ḥdm id. (SD, 59).

**2.16.10** CA ḥadaḡa “to miscarry (lit. throw out its child before the right time)”; ’aḥdaḡa-t “give birth to a crippled child (e.g. *having no hands*, etc.)”.

**2.16.11** CA ḥaḡḡala “put to shame, make ashamed; shame”; muḡḡilu “disgraceful, shameful, shocking”: comp. ḡalla “be dignified, great, glorious”.

**2.16.12** CA ḥadira “be benumbed”; CII ḥaddara; CIV ’aḥdara “to narcotize, make benumbed”; muḥdirru “narcotic”.

SL distinguishes between [ḥōr] “benumbed; narcotic” (with a variant ḥdr) and [ḥdr] “woman’s private room” = CA ḥidru “curtain by which woman’s inner chamber is concealed, woman’s private chamber”, Sab. ḥdr “chamber; funeral chamber”; mḥdr “residence” (SD, 59), BHeb. ḥeder “an apartment, chamber”, esp. *the inner one* (OT, 297), Cush.: Som. hurd- “sleep”, Rnd udur-, Bay hudur- id., Afar -iḥdir- id. (HSED, n. 1324).

**2.16.13** CA ḥaḡru (said of arse) “stinky”, ḥaḡā “filth and meanness” is perh. from [gaw-] “dung” (§3.17.10 below).

**2.16.14** Ug. ḥlḵ “bad; to perish” (UG, 530, 534), Assy. ḥalāḵu “be destroyed; be lost” (King, 1898: 348), DAram. ḥlḵ “perdition” (NWSI I, 379), CA ḥlḵ “be destroyed” also “old and worn out; ragged; tatter (clothes)”, Akk. ḥulāḵu “old or torn clothes”, Heb. ḥālūḵ, Aram. ḥlḵ, Soq. ḥalaḵ id. (HSED, n. 1327).

a) Any native speaker of Arabic or a Semitist who knows other meanings expressed by the CA root will surely demand explanation and clarification of the semantic relationships that seems to link CA ‘*negative notion*’ of the root as “worn out, destroyed” to CA ‘*positive notion*’ as expressed by *ḥulḥu* “morality, good disposition, good nature” as in the Koran: (وَإِنَّكَ لَعَلَىٰ خُلُقٍ عَظِيمٍ) ‘*And most certainly you stand on sublime morality*’ (68: 4); *ḥalīḥu* “competent, suitable or fit”; ‘*aḥlāḥu* “morals, manners”; and so forth.

Before beginning our investigation, one should not forget that the same root also derives into *ḥalaḥa*, CVIII ‘*ihtalaḥa* “to fabricate or invent a lie”; *mu-ḥtalaḥu* “false, not genuine, fictitious”; *muḥtaliḥu* in a bad sense “inventor, creator”, *ḥalḥu* “lie, falsehood” (cf. Koran: 38: 7), etc. Also, in a good sense *ḥalaḥa* “to invent, create (God)”: cf. Koran 75: 38, 87: 2, 96: 1, etc.; *ḥālīḥu* “creator (God)” (cf. Koran 6: 102, 35: 3, 59: 24, etc.); *ḥalḥu* “creatures” (cf. Koran 14:19), and so forth. It is worth-noting that CA has a number of roots denoting “to create (God); “Creator (God)”; creatures”: as in *bara’a* id., in Sab., BHeb., Syr., BAram. id. (see §2.24.58), and that such notions are in some cases derived from “to dig, bore, cut out” (cf. CA *nbṭ* “to dig for water”; CX “to invent” in a good sense, Sab. *nbṭ* “dig a well down to water”: cf. SD, 91), or from “to sow, scatter, esp. *seed*” as in CA *ḥara’a*, Ug. *dr-t*, Sab. *m-ḥr’-t* (DRS IV, 340).

b) In going back to CA [ḥlḥ] “morals; manner; to create, etc.”, it may be a compound of \*ḥal- plus \*-ḥ- (meaning?). The first element is seen in CA *ḥalla-tu* fem. “personal trait, characteristic”; *ḥulla-tu* “friendship”.

c) On the other hand, Semitic [ḥlḥ] “be bad, destroy, etc.” also seems to be a compound of \*ḥal- plus \*-ḥ- as in CA *ḥalla* “to bore through”; ‘*aḥalla* “to break one’s word or promise, to wrong, injure”; *ḥalalu* “weakness, corruption”, etc. = BHeb. *ḥālāl* “to bore through, perforate, pierce”; *Piel.* “to profane, defile” also “to break a covenant”; *Hiph.* “to break one’s word, faith”; *Niph.* “be profaned, defiled” (OT, 317-318). In fact, the basic problem confronting me in the analysis of this trilateral is the interchange of /h/ and /ḥ/.

d) What I am sure of, however, is that if the original meaning of \*ḥal- is “to bore through”, then it is definitely a compound of \*ḥw- “empty; hole” and \*-l- “both or two of a kind”. The deep meaning assigned to \*-l- is based on the meaning of ḥal- in CA and on the meaning of some of its derivatives in all other Semitic languages. For what concerns CA, the real meaning of *ḥalla* is “to bore through s.t. until you reach the opposite side of it, i.e. *bore from side to side, from front to back*”, hence CVIII ‘*ihtalla* “to thrust someone’s heart with a spear in a way that the spear will cross it from side to side”; *ḥalalu* “opening between any two things, puncture or hole”, pl. *ḥilālu* as in the Koran (24: 43): (فَتَرَى الْوَدْقَ يَخْرُجُ مِنْ خَلَالِهِ) ‘*You see the rain coming forth from their holes*’ (‘*their*’ refers to *clouds*, i.e. *rain coming forth from holes in clouds*: cf. Al ‘Ayn IV, 140. This illustration of the meaning of *ḥalla* helps us grasp the deep idea lying beneath Semitic n-ḥl “sieve” (see §2.11.25 above), i.e. *open at the top and bottom, all the way through*.

e) As one should expect, there are so many CA words that deal with different aspects and ways of ‘boring’. Of these the only one whose surface & deep meaning is identical with our reconstructed { \*ḥw + \*-l- } is [ḥrḥ] as in *ḥaraḥa* “make a hole or opening in,

bore/pierce from side to side (i.e. *from front to back, from right to left, from top to bottom, and the like*) as in *haraḳa* (ʿa)θ *ḡauba* or (ʿa)l *ḡāʾiṭu* “make an opening in the garment or the wall from side to side”, and in the Koran: (إنك لن تخرق الأرض) lit. *You cannot perforate the Earth from side to side* (17: 37), also see Koran 18: 71; *harḳu* “opening, aperture”; CVIII *ʾihtaraḳa* “to cross or pass from side to side”, hence *muḡtaraḳu* “passage”; *harḳāʾu*, said of a sheep, “having a round hole in the ear”<sup>196</sup>. Ibin Durayd (Jamharah I, 590) does not find any difference in meaning or in use between *haraḳa* – CVIII *ʾihtaraḳa* and CVIII *ʾihtalaḳa*, and states «وخرقت الشيء واختلقتة سواء». This instance, like very numerous others, shows that /l/ and /r/ are here from one single phoneme. To stem \**hal-* certainly belong CA *ḡalla-tu*, *ḡarra-tu* “low-lying land, ravine”. In SL, as in many other dialects, *ḡallē* is the only one in use. To my understanding, *ḡallē* fem. is “a kind of low-lying land flanked by two hills or hillocks and open all the way through” from CA *ḡallu* “an open path between hills of sand”; *ḡalalu* pl. above (Al ʿAyn IV, 140). To grasp this meaning, *stretch the palm of the hand and bring the fingers close to one another, the tiny openings you see between them are called ḡalalu*.

The Egyp. cognate is *hlw* ~ *hrw* “low-lying land” (EHD I, 561). The root [hr-] is also seen in Egyp. *hr* “grave, tomb” (EHD I, 561), Akk. *hurru* “hole”, CA *ḡurru* id.; *ḡurra-tu* “low lying land between two hills”. All are certainly related to Akk. *ḡarū* “to dig”, Ug. *hr*, Ge. *hrw* id. (§2.16.36 below).

**2.16.15** Aram. *ḡlṭ* “to mix (mixed drink)”, OffAram. *ḡlṭ* “mixture”, Akk. *ḡulūṭu* “a kind of drink” (NWSI I, 374), SA: Meh. *helōṭ*, Shh *holoṭ* “to mix”, CA *ḡlṭ* “to blend, mix, mingle together”. The basic meaning of the trilateral in CA is a mixture involving *dissimilar or heterogeneous elements*; hence *ḡalīṭu* “a medley”; *ʾaḡlāṭu* “the mob; confusion, disorder”, etc. It is the opposite of “pure, unmixed” (ML II, 208).

**2.16.16** CA *hlʿ* “to dethrone, dislocate, depose, remove; libertine; dissoluteness”.

**2.16.17** Phoen., Moab., OAram. *ḡlp* “to go away, disappear, vanish” also in OAram. “to succeed; successor” (NWSI I, 376f; Rosenthal, AG, 10), BHeb. *ḡālap* “to pass away, vanish, to pass on (against any one)”; *ḡālōp* “a passing away, departure, decease, as of parents” (OT, 316, 319), Ge. *ḡalāfā* “to pass”, Te. *ḡalfa*, Tna. *ḡallāfā* “to pass”, Har. *ḡuluf bāya* id., Amh., Gaf. *allāf(m)* id. (HED, 82), CA *ḡallafa* “to leave children at death, leave behind”, hence *ḡalafu* “descendants, offspring” and *ḡalfu* “behind”; *ḡalafa* “to succeed, substitute” also “Caliph, successor” = Sab. *ḡlf-t* “viceroy”; *sʿḡlḡf* “to appoint a viceroy” (SD, 60) = CA *ʾistaḡlafa* “to appoint Caliph or successor”.

a) CA CIII *ḡālafa* “to disagree, violate, disagree with, contradict, be contrary” = Egyp. *ḡʾlf* “to contradict” (EHD I, 533), CA CVIII *ʾihtalafa* “to differ, or be different, from”; CIV *ʾaḡlafa* “to break (one’s promise)” = Sab. *h-ḡlf* “to violate an oath” (SD, 60).

b) It is indeed amazing that most of the meanings expressed by [ḡlf] can be expressed by [ḡl] as in *ḡalla* “to leave”; *ḡalla* “to abandon”; CIV *ʾaḡalla*, said of a rule, law, etc.,

<sup>196</sup> A quadrilateral [hrdḳ] as in *ḡarda* “make openings in from side to side” has developed in SL and other dialects by dissimilation from *ḡarraḳa*.

“to violate” also “to break (one’s promise)”. The basic meaning of the radicals /h-l-p/ is “a thing/person (comes) after another to replace it/him, hence “after” also “behind”. Another derived notion is “difference, change” (ML II, 210f). A sentence as in Har. *ḥuluf* (= passed) *zāya* (= that) *amāt* (= year) “the year that passed” is expressed in CA by *ḥalā* as in *’al ’ām* (the year) *’al laḏī* (that) *ḥalā* (= passed). The /-l/ of *ḥalā* here = afore: see §3.17.15 below.

In Sab. *hlf* also express “dress” and “passage between hills” = CA *ma-ḥlūfu* “patched dress”; *hilāfu* “sleeve of a dress” and *ḥalīfu* “passage or path (perh. *behind a mountain or in a mountain*)”.

**2.16.18** Sab. *ḥmṣ* “deface (an inscription)” (SD, 61), OffAram., Samal. *ṭmṣ* “false” as in *šhd* (= witness) *ḥmṣ* “a false witness” (NWSI I, 382), CA *ḥamṣu* “famine, hunger”.

**2.16.19** Sab. *ḥmt* “pestilence; disorder” (SD, 61), CA *ḥamṭu* as in the Koran: (خبط وأتل) *بجنتين زواتي أكل* *two garden yielding bitter fruits and 356amarisks* (34:16). The word denotes either “bitter inedible fruits” or “poisonous fruits capable of killing”, said of wine “having a tangy taste”; *hamiṭa* “be agitated or stirred up and angry; clash against one another (waves)”, etc.

**2.16.20** OffAram., Edom. *ṭmr* “leaven” (NWSI I, 382), Phoen., OffAram., Edom., Palm. *ḥmr* “wine”, CA *ḥmr* “to ferment, leaven; wine”; *hamīra-tu* fem. “yeast”. The very same deep idea (of transformation) is also seen in Sab. *ḥm* “coagulated milk, or *laban*” (SD, 61). Note that *laban* can’t be produced unless its special leaven is mixed with milk and left for some hours to ferment.

The root [ḥmr] exists in Sab. and expresses “to grant, bestow a favor on s.o.” also “slave”. LA’s comments on these two meanings make it clear that they are derived from “*enslave*” (= CX *’istahmara* id.), and that the concept “grant, etc.” is “to grant s.o. a slave, to give him a slave as a gift” (= CIV *’aḥmara* id.).

**2.16.21** CA *hmm*, *hwm* “musty, ill-smelling, stinky, decayed”; *hāmu*, *mu-ḥimmu*, *usu*. said of meat, “stinky, decayed” (Al *’ayn* IV, 147); *hāmu* “raw (material), untrained, unrefined, inexperienced (person)” = Egyp. *ḥm* “ne pas savoir” also “stupid, untrained (of an animal), ignorant, unlearned, inactive”; *m ḥm* “ignorantly, without, destitute of”, etc. (EHD I, 546), Cush.: Bed. *gām* “ne pas savoir”; agim “sot”, Sa., Af. *agam* “ne pas savoir” (VPHS, 109, n. 161). Besides, CA *ḥammā-nu* pl. “vulgar (people)” = Egyp. *ḥmī* “worthless person, fiend” (EHD I, 546) = CA *hāmilu* “worthless person” (= Egyp. *ḥmī* id.) also “inactive” (= Egyp. *ḥmḥm* id.). Other derivatives of [ḥm] are CA *hummu* “hencoop”, so-called from its stinky smell (LA); *himmu* “empty garden”; *ḥamma* “to sweep or clean the house” (perh. orig. *make empty of*); *maḥmūmu* adj., said of the heart, “pure, in the sense free from (*empty of*) *jealousy and rancor*”, with suffixed /-d/: *ḥamada* “be inactive, died out (esp. *fire*)”.

Some other roots based on [ḥm] are CA *ḥamḡaru*, *ḥamḡarīru* “dirty water, salty water” (*ḥamḡarīru* id.). Note that *ḥmḡ* itself denotes “stinky meat” and may extend to dates “decayed dates”. It should also be noted that \*-r in [ḥmḡr] adds to the meaning of

[hm̥g̥] the notion of “water”.

According to Thaʿālibi (FL, p. 121), ḥamma, said only of cooked or roasted meat, denotes “be stinky”. If the meat, however, is neither cooked nor roasted and still gives a bad smell, then it said to be ṣalla, CIV ʾaṣalla “be stinky” = SL ṣaṣan id. (see §2.3.29 above).

**2.16.22** Phoen. ḥnḵ “to strangle” (NWSI I, 389), BHeb., Syr. ḥnḵ “to strangle, throttle” (OT, 331), Assyr. ḥanāḵu “to strangle”, CA ḥanaḵa “to strangle, throttle, suffocate”.

**2.16.23** Ug. ḥnp “be bad; bad” (UG, 530), CA ḥnf “the worst flax”.

**2.16.24** CA ḥnd “obscene, foul”.

**2.16.25** CA ḥanasu “flat nose, snub nose, short nose”: comp. ḥanafu “twisted or inflected nose”. The word should not be confused with ma-ḥanna- “nose”, a natural and expected development of ḥanna, ḥanḥana “to nasalize, speak through the nose” = Egyp. ḥnw pl. “utterance, speech” (EHD I, 549).

**2.16.26** CA ḥnʿ “to behave in a servile manner”.

**2.16.27** Sab. ḥny “cause (pestilence) many deaths among people” (SD, 61), perh. Egyp. ḥn “calamity, an event that causes sorrow, misfortune” (EHD I, 549), CA ḥny, CIV ʾḥny “to perish, exterminate” as in the PIP of Nābiyah:

«...ʾaḥna-t ʾalaihā (ʾa)l laḏī ʾaḥnā ʾalā ludadi».

In both Sab. and CA the root also expresses “many”. Besides, CA ḥny denotes, exactly like [hwn], “to betray, etc.” (§3.16.44 below).

**2.16.28** BHeb. ḥpr “be ashamed, put to shame” (OT, 335), CA ḥafira “to blush, be shy”.

**2.16.29** CA ʾaḥfaḵa [ḥfḵ] “to fail”. Some additional examples are: [ḥft] “physically feeble or weak out of hunger”, orig. *empty of food*: futāt pieces of (bread); futta-tu “lump of dates”; fatta fī (in) sāʾidihi (his forearm) “become weak and dishearted”, [ḥfθl] lit. “physical or mental weakness”: fθl “stupid and foolish with feebleness (= not solid) and hard understanding”, [ḥfḡ] “one with crooked-leg, having pain in the legs from tiredness”, [ḥfḡl] “repugnant and filthy”: fḡl “a type of lameness characterized by dragging one’s leg on the ground out of tiredness”, etc.

**2.16.30** Akk. ḥurbitu “uninhabited place, wilderness” (AG, 78), OAram. ḥrb “ruined” (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 3), BHeb. ḥrb “be laid waste”; ḥrbh “desolation, wasteness, desert” (OT, 341), CA ḥariba “lay in ruins, esp. *a place, house*”; ḥurbatu or ḥaribatu “ruined place; tumbledown (a place)”.

Semitic [hrb] is a compound consisting of [haw] “empty > destruction”, an infix -r-, and [baW] “house”, and is ultimately cognate with Egyp. ḥb “to destroy, lay waste”; ḥb-t “place of destruction”, orig. “*empty place, later empty dwelling or house*”.

**2.16.31** CA hrf “become dotard, senile, imbecile; feeble-minded, dotage”, orig. from the expression «*ḥarīfu (ʿa)l ʿumri*», *Autumn of life > advanced in age > mental deterioration of old age*: cf. BHeb. ḥrp “autumn” (OT, 347), Sab. hrf id. (SD, 62), etc. The root also expresses in BHeb. “to scorn, reproach” as well as “confuse” = CA “feeble minded” above (Ryder, 1974: 99).

**2.16.32** OffAram., DAram. ḥrš “deaf and dumb, deaf”, Pun. ḥrš “to silence, put to silence; deaf” (NWSI I, 408-409), CA hrs “dumb; muteness”, BHeb. ḥrš “deaf”; ḥereš in a bad sense “an artifice, art, spoken of magic arts”, BAram. ḥrš “magician, enchanter” (OT, 350), Phoen. ḥrš, Pun. “handicraftsman, artisan” (NWSI I, 408), CA mi-ḥrašu, the inst. of \*ḥaraša “a piece of wood used for engraving or inscribing”.

**2.16.33** Ug. ḥr’ “to defecate, feces” (UG, 532), CA ḥr’ id., BHeb., Aram. ḥry “excrement, dung”, Te. ḥaro id. In Hamitic languages: Berb.: So. ihhan, pl., “excrement”, Cush.: Sa., Af. harā, Som. ḥār id. (VPHS, 108, n. 154). It is *probable* that Egyp. ḥ’r “excrement” (EHD I, 528) is cognate. However, the Egyp. word may be from a compound of [ḥ’] plus stem \*r “excrement” (see §2.14.19 above).

**2.16.34** Sab. hrs<sup>2</sup> “ravage territory, destroy monument”; htrs<sup>2</sup> “plunder, pillage” (SD, 62), CA mu-ḥāraša-tu “taking by force”; ḥaršu “worn out (garment or utensil)”.

**2.16.35** Sab. hrw “be committed (offence)” (SD, 62).

**2.16.36** Akk. hurru “hole”, CA ḥurru “hole in the millstone to put the corn in it”, BHeb. ḥōr [r. ḥwr] “a hole” = CA ḥaur- “anus”, i.e. *hole*, Ug. ḥr-t “grave” (UG, 533; OT, 302), Egyp. hr id. (EHD I, 560), Assy. ḥarū “to dig” (King 1898: 348), Ge. hrw id.

The three roots just set forth above, namely [ḥr, hrW, hwr], are from a compound [ḥau-] “empty” + [-r-].

**2.16.37** Akk. huršu “mountain”, BHeb. ḥoreš “forest” (VPHS, 108, n. 152), Assy. huršu “mountain, wooded highland” (King, 1898: 349), Ug. ḥršn “mountain” (UG, 534) = CA ḥuršūmu “tip (lit. nose) of a mountain, great or high mountain, elevated and coarse land”. It seems to me that the CA word (hence its Semitic cognates) is from ḥaš-mu “high mountain” also “nose”, which is in turn from \*ḥušš- (becoming hurš- by dissimilating the first \*-š- to \*-r- (see §2.17.80 below) as in CA ḥuššu “hill”; ḥaššā’u adj. = ḥašina-tu = “coarse, rough land”; ḥišāšu “piece of wood inserted into the nose of a beast of burden” also denotes “mountainous snake”, Egyp. ḥ’s-t “mountainous region” (HSED, n. 1358).

#### Comments

CA ḥašša [ḥš II] is one of numerous verbs in the language expressing to “enter (into)”; ḥišāšu, said of a man, “one who is bold, smart, swift and knows how to enter into”. It is possible that the orig. meaning of the CA verb is “to enter into a (dense)

mountainous forest”.

a) SL *haš* signifies “to enter”, in some contexts “to enter stealthily”, but in general it is not a good term for “to enter”. In my mind, *haš* “to enter through a narrow opening”, hence *bašaš* [r. *bħš*] “make a small opening or hole; to bore” (DRS II, 59); *boħš* “a narrow opening, anus”; *biħwāš* “a very tiny opening”. There is no doubt that \*b- is from \*bū-, shortened to \*-u (i.e. \*-o- in *boħš*) before a cluster of two consonants (like Sem. *bi’r*- “well” from \*bū’r-, i.e. *bw’r*-: see §2.17.56 below), and that this \*bū- is certainly the same as \*bū- in SL *bōž* “a small hole dug in the ground for planting in it any kind of plant”. This is exactly the very same \*bū- seen in CA *bu’ra-tu* “(a small) pit” (§2.13.3 above).

b) Before quitting this section I still have a few words to say about [*ħš*, *bħš*]. One may object to the analysis of [*bħš*] as consisting of {\*b- + \*-ħš}, proposing instead a proot \*bħ- + \*-š-, and citing as evidence some trilaterals beginning with \*bħ- and expressing “to bore” as in CA [*bħķ*] “hollow-eyed, blind” or more precisely, said of the eye, “sink down (have a deep hole) after blindness”, [*bħš*], [*bħz*] “to make (one, oneself) + hollow-eyed, to gouge out an eye”, *bħs* “to gouge out the eye with the finger”, etc. The following facts must, however, be born in mind:

c) To my understanding, CA [*bħķ*] is a compound of at least three conspicuous elements \*bW- + ħ(w)- “empty” + \*-ķ- “eye”. This is the very same \*-ķ- seen in §2.10.14 above.

Again to my understanding, *bħš* ~ *bħs* ~ *bħz* (comp. CA *bşķ* ~ *bsķ* ~ *bzķ* “to spit”, *lşķ* ~ *lsķ* ~ *lzķ* “to glue, stick to”, etc. (see §2.2.48 above) are variants of one single word \*bħđ, which is a compound of \*bW- + ħw- + -đ-. Final \*-đ- is linguistically identical with \*-đ- in [*γmđ*] “close the eye” (for \*γm-, see §2.2.1 above), etc., in [*yşş* ~ *yđđ*], etc. see §2.6.13 above.

d) To test the correctness of my view, you may take the trilateral [*bħš*] and drop its initial prefix or proot \*b-, the resulting word \*-ħš from \*ħwş expresses “hollow-eyed” as in adj. *’aħwaşu*, n. *ħawaşu*; CIII *hāwaşa* “to lower one’s eye, close the eye”, a compound of \*ħw- + \*-đ- (Al ‘Ayn IV, 285; LA).

**2.16.38** Sab. *hr’* “throw s.o. into a panic” (SD, 61), CA *ħari’u* “one who is weak, shaky, insecure”; *ħari’a* “be weak or faint, be easily broken” also “be afraid”, SL *ħarra’* “to scare or frighten only in the sense of making premeditated action or deed to make one (who is usu. known as being easily frightened) scare, but with no intention of hurting him”. For \*ra’-, see §§2.12.27 above.

**2.16.39** CA *ħtl* “to hide oneself in order to deceive” as a hunter does in hunting and a lion in trying to seize a prey, later develops into “to deceive” and into “to hide by s.t.”, BHeb. *ħtl* “to wrap in bandages, e.g. a wound”; *ħetlon*, name of a city in Northern Syria, orig. “wrapped up, hiding place” (OT, 355).

Some other roots beginning with *ħt*- are: CA [*ħt’*] = [*ħtl*], *ħtr* “to betray, deceive; corruption”, [*ħt’r*] “deceiver, a woman or anything that one cannot trust”, [*ħt’l*] “be slow”, [*ħtrm*] “be silent out of fear”.



**2.16.40** CA *hatā* “to turn pale due to sickness or fear”; *muhtatī* “deficient, short of”.

**2.16.41** Akk. *hītu* “sin, fault, evil” (AG, 77), OAram. *ḥṭ* “sin, offence” (AG, 10), EBHeb., Palm., OffAram. *ḥṭ* “to sin” (NWSI I, 362), OSA *ḥṭ*, Eth. *ḥaṭa’a* id. (Stehle, JAOS 60, 1960: 516), CA *ḥṭ* “sin, fault, wrong; to sin”.

**2.16.42** CA *haḏa’a* “to submit, surrender, give way, be humiliated”.

**2.16.43** CA *haṭira* (medial /-i-/ could also be /-u-/ or /-a-/) “to thicken, inspissate”; *haṭara* “to feel nausea and become malicious and confused”; *ḥuṭāra-tu* “sediment, dregs”.

Some other trilaterals are: CA [*ḥθrm*] “one who thinks that all things tend toward evil”, [*hθ’*] “mean”, [*hθ’m*] “to smear or spot with blood”, [*haṭā*] “to dung (usu. *a bull*)”, [*hθlm*] “to take by stealth; mixture”, [*hθm*] (in modern dialects, esp. Arabia, *ḥašm* “nose”) lit. “coarse or rough nose, width of the tip of nose, shortness in a bull’s nose” also “fat (lit. *thick*) and elevated” as in the PIP of Nabīyah describing the vulva of king Nu’mān’s wife:

«wa ’iḏā lamasta lamasta ’*aḥṭama* ḡāṭiman  
mutaḥaiyizan bi-makānihi mil’u (’a)l yadi» (DN, p. 42, L. 2).

**2.16.44** CA *hwn* “be dishonest, betray; traitor”.

**2.16.45** CA *ḥwr* “to languish, faint, lose heart; weak”, Ge. *hwr* “weak, feeble”, Egyp. *ḥwrrw* “miserable, poor”, Cush.: Ag., Bil. *hawan*, Sa. *Hawal*, Af. *awal* “be feeble, weak” (VPHS 104, n. 131), a compound of [*h-*] “empty” and [*wr*] “great, superior” as in Egyp. *wr* id.

**2.19.46** CA *hwf* “to fear; fearful, timid”.

**2.16.47** Sab. *h-hyb* “to neglect; ambush”; *h-hb* “to fail (rain)”; *hybt* “drought, failure of rain” imp. *Yhbn* “be in arrears of debt” (SD, 64), CA [*hyb*]: *hāba* “be disappointed, to disbelieve, to lose, to fail”; *ḥaiyaba* “to dispossess or deprive of; disappoint”.

**2.16.48** Sab. *hys<sup>1</sup>* “act treacherously against” (SD, 64), in CA *hys* expresses “be rotten and stinky”. The Sab. root is semantically identical with SL *hāwaz* (note that the sequence \**hws* is impermissible).

**2.16.49** CA *taḥaiyafa* [*hyf*], *taḥaiyafa* [*r. ḥyf*] “to diminish a thing by cutting off its edges”.

**2.16.50** Assy. *hipū* “to shatter, destroy” (King, 1898: 348), CA *ḥafa’a* “make go to ruin (e.g. a house), to kill (e.g. a person)”.

**2.16.51** Ug. *ḥsr* “be lacking” (UG, 533), Phoen. *ḥsr* “need, lack” (PG, 103), BHeb.

ḥāssar “to lack, want, be without any thing; diminish, fail”, heḥsīr “to deprive”, Eth. ’aḥsara “to debase, defile, violate (a woman)”, OSA ḥs’r “to dedicate (a hierodule)” (Stehle, JAOS 60, 1940: 524; OT, 333), OffAram., Palm. ḥsr “to lack, be in want of” as adj. “defective, imperfect” (NWSI I, 394), CA ḥasira “to lose; to fail; fall off; damage, loss”.

The stem underlying Semitic [ḥsr] and many other kindred trilaterals is preserved in SL ḥass “to diminish, grow less, become less, make less; minus”. This stem has developed from CA [hws] “diminish, grow less”. Some trilaterals based on proot [haW-] are CA [hwš] “emaciated (of belly), growing lean or slim”, [hwš] “small and narrow eye”, etc.

**2.16.52** Aṣma’i asked Mufaddal about the signification of *ḥaiṣ-an* in the following line of PIP (A’sha):

«...laḳad nāl ḥaiṣan min ‘Ufairata ḥā’iṣan».

Mufaddal said: it is from yahūṣu “(he gives) very little”; ḥaiṣu “small, little” (MA, 140). It is amazing that the word also means “the best” (LA). It is perh. based on *ḥai* “good” > *ḥai-ru* “better” (see §2.19 below).

**2.16.53** Sab. ḥs’s<sup>1</sup> “injury, damages”; ḥs’w “to harm, injure s.o.”, ḥs’s<sup>3</sup> id. (SD, 62), OSA ḥs<sup>3</sup>s<sup>3</sup> “one who injures”, ḥs’ “to injure”, Soq. ḥeš “be wanting, not to be” (Stehle, JAOS 60, 1940: 526), CA ḥss “mean, vile, base”, ḥs’ “be despised, spurned, vile; shame” as in the Koran: (كونوا قردة خاسئين), *Be (you pl.) despised apes* (2: 65).

**2.16.54** CA ḥasafa “sink down (only *earth* or *ground*)”. Semantically speaking, the word is so deeply associated with ‘*ground, earth*’ to such an extent that one can say: *it is a compound of [haW-], [-s-] above and \*-f- “ground, earth; soil”*.

**2.13.55** CA ḥṣy “to apprehend, fear, dread; timid”.

**2.16.56** Akk.-Assyr. ḥušāḥu “hunger, famine” as vb “to desire, long for”. A sequence like /ḥšh/ is not permitted in CA. The language had once a similar sequence [ḥrḥ] in ḥirḥu “vagina”, but its final -ḥ was dropped, hence the biradical *ḥiru*. As one should expect, the pl. form of *ḥiru* has always been ’aḥrāḥu, with final -ḥ being kept intact *only in the plural*. The sole reason for the preservation of the pl. form is the existence of /-ā-/ between /r-/ and /-ḥ/. If you shorten or drop this vowel, then /-ḥ/ will surely disappear.

The Akk. trilateral is based on \*ḥw as in CA haw “hunger”. One may, if he wishes, suffix /-š/ or even /-s/ to CA [hau-] and obtain two trilaterals expressing “hunger”.

**2.16.57** CA ḥšn “harsh, coarse, rough” as a verb ḥašuna, is certainly from \*ḥaš-. As a matter of fact all verbs with original stems {Fa’ula} are in their entirety, together with their HS cognates, derived from adjectives and nouns, such as *ḥaṣura* “become short”, *kabura* “become big, great”, *ḥasuna* “become good or fair”, *ṣayura* “become small”, *maruḍa* “become ill”, *’aduḥa* “become sweet (water), and so forth.

**2.16.58** Assyr. *hašalu* “destroyer” (King, 1898: 349), perh. BHeb. *ḥšl* “to enfeeble”, CA *hsl* ~ *hšl* “bad, despicable (of anything); vile and feeble”, *hšr* “the worst of anything”.

**2.16.59** CA *hašamu* “loss of the sense of smell”: *šammu* “the sense of smell”; *šamma* “to smell” (FL, p. 107).

**2.16.60** CA *hzy* “disgrace, shame, dishonor”.

**2.16.61** CA *sahīfu* “trivial, weak-minded”, n. *suhfu*: *hiffa-tu* “recklessness thoughtlessness” also “light”, the opposite of *heavy*, SA: Meh., Shh *ḥef*, Cush.: *happii*, Chad.: Fyer *fifyo*, Sokoro *effi id.* (HSED, n. 1345).

## 2.17 COMPOUNDS OF MISCELLANEOUS ELEMENTS

1) The term ‘*compound*’ is used here and elsewhere as a cover term for any new word introduced into Hamito-Semitic by combining two or more elements or parts of two or more elements. Hundreds of such compounds have already been examined throughout the foregoing sections, esp. in §§2.4, 3.12, & 2.13-3.16 above.

As a general rule, the combination of two elements to form a compound results in the loss of a radical consonant, a fact to which we have already drawn attention. The most potential candidate for disappearance is a semivowel /y, w, or ‘/. The most common types of HS word formation are compounding and later blending. A few blends are found in pre-Islamic CA as in ‘*abšama* “belong to the tribe of ‘*Abd* (= slave) + ‘*šams* (= sun)” = *slave or worshipper of šams*, i.e. *sun*, where the final radical of each word was dropped. Another blend is *Samurā’u*, a city in Iraq, from a sentence *surrā* (= pass. *be pleased*) *man* (= *who*) *ra’ā* (*he sees*) = (*it*) *pleases whoever sees it*. One may note from the two just cited compounds that strong radicals, like weak radicals, can also disappear<sup>197</sup>.

2) In some compounds, however, the two elements are preserved and any compound of this type is self-evident. For example, CA *zaḥankafu* “one creeping along the ground on his ass or buttocks (i.e. *on his back*)” is a compound of *zaḥ*- “move” (§2.3.40 above) and *ḵaf*- “back” joined together by infixed /-n-/.

The loss of a semivowel does not often affect the clarity of the compound meaning—as, for example, CA *ḥaḍāfīru* (ḥuḍfūru, ḥiḍfāru) [r. ḥḍfr], said of a thing, “side and top” also “side, height (pl.), entirety”, a compound of *ḥiḍā*’ “side” and *fauru* “summit, top”. Another example is from modern Arabic dialects (Leb., Syr., Egyp., etc.) *ġāb* “to bring”, which is from CA *ġā’a bi* = “to come with”, i.e. consisting of *ġā’a* “to come” and prep. *bi* “with”. An example from BHeb. is [drd’] “pearl of wisdom”, correctly analyzed by Gesenius (OT, 333) as a compound of \*dr as in CA *durra*-tu fem. “pearl” and \*d’ as in BHeb. and gen. Sem. *da’*- “knowledge, wisdom”. Some examples from Egyp. are [m’ḥḍ] “white gazelle, antelope” (EHD I, 275) is an obvious utterance of *m’* “antelope, gazelle” and *ḥḍ* “white”, [ḥ’rps] “a kind of cake, loaf” (EHD I, 533) is from *ḥ’r* “food” and *ps(’)* “cake, loaf; baker”. Such self-evident combinations lie outside the interests and purposes of this study.

Fortunately, we still have many of such self-explaining compounds, esp. in CA, that are as old as CA [d’k] and [dk] and Egyp. [da’] plus [’ak] (see §§2.1.6.5 & 2.1.6.5.1 above). For example, we have seen that [hw] signifies as in *huwwa*-tu, *hāwiya*-tu fem. “abyss, chasm” and \*-’ug- “eye”. Combining the two proots together gives rise to a trilateral [ḥġġ], whose medial /-ġ-/ is, by regressive assimilation, from /-w-/. As for the meaning of the trilateral, it is the sum total of the meanings of its two parts: *hu*- “hollow”

<sup>197</sup> Another area in which a radical disappears is in the plurals of words with more than four radicals like *ḍiḍa’u* “frog” > pl. *ḍaḍāḍi* (or *ḍaḍāḍi’u*), *safarġal*- “quince” > *safāriġu*, while its dim. *sufayriġu* or *sufayġilu*, etc.

(< “abyss, chasm”) + -ġ “eye” as a vb *haġġa*.

3) Still, there are trilaterals formed from earlier bilaterals and unilaterals by the adoption of a negative element as an inseparable part of the root. So far, we have seen many of them, and a detailed study of all types of such compounds will be given in §2.21 below.

4) Our analysis of Semitic trilaterals into compounds and blends uncovers a serious problem yet unsolved. The problem involves not the recognition and identification of compounds or blends, together with their constituent elements, in Hamito-Semitic roots, but *only the exact meanings of the constituent elements of many compounds and their original parts of speech*. Putting it in other words, there are many compounds whose elements seem to be proots originally expressing either identical or similar meanings. For example, we have seen in §2.10.11 above that [mr'] = “to see”, and that the trilateral is obviously a compound of \*m- (~ \*mW-) and \*r'- . Are the two elements synonymous and the trilateral meant originally “to see with the eye”? Suppose they were, which of the elements stands for ‘see’? It is most likely, however, that the trilateral is based on mar'ā “scene, view, act of seeing” (< ra' “to see”) > vb mara'. Another example may be [ħwm > ħmm] “heat; burn” (§2.2.6 above), whose 1<sup>st</sup> element [ħaW-] is orig. a term for “sun”, i.e. heat, burning”, while its 2<sup>nd</sup> element may be a prep. or a term for “burn”. It is most likely a prep. = CA, Egyp. -m in [’wm]: see §2.17.1, under *Comments I* below.

5) Let us suppose that my observation is correct. Then, there should have existed a historical relationship between two processes of word formation: *compounding* and *blending*, on the one hand, and the so-called *Itbā'* in CA, on the other hand. However, regardless of whether the observation is or is not correct, it remains that an understanding of *Itbā'* is indispensable for a scientific study and analysis of Hamito-Semitic roots. Let us see what *Itbā'* is and why we attach such importance to it.

*Itbā'* is similar to reduplication and used to refer to a sequence of two or more rhyming (root-)words which are usually alike in all but a single phonetic feature as in *ḵasīm wasīm*, both words mean ‘handsome’; the phonetic difference in the phonetic composition of their 1<sup>st</sup> radicals is often uncorrelated with a difference in meaning: *ḵasīm* = “handsome” and *wasīm* = “handsome”. Bin Faris distinguished two types of *Itbā'*<sup>198</sup>, depending on whether the second element has a meaning as follows:

5a) the second element is a free morpheme (i.e. *can occur alone*) and has a definable meaning and is used to lay emphasis on or strengthen the signification of the first element as in *wasīmu* above.

5b) the second element is a bound word that has neither a known meaning nor known derivation as in *ḥasan basan* “fair, good, handsome”, where the meaning of *ḥasan* is “fair, good, handsome” and of *basan* is unknown.

The sole reason for assigning to *basan* an unknown meaning and, consequently, establishing the second type of *Itbā'*, goes back to Ibin Durayd, who asked Abu Hatim about the meaning of *basan* in the above mentioned phrase. Abu Hatim’s answer was ‘*I don’t know it*’ (Jamharah III, 1253-1254; Muzhir I, 415). Based on this particular

<sup>198</sup> For general information on *Itbā'* and old Arab scholars’ views on this subject, including Bin Faris, see Siyyuṭī’s *Muzhir I*, p. 414-415 and Abu Ali Ḳālī’s *Amāli II*, 208-219.

instance, such scholars as Bin Faris, Amidi, kisā'i, and Rāzi drew *a general conclusion* that the second element has no meaning whatsoever, but only a function, which is to strengthen the meaning of the preceding word. However, Sabki rightly contended that *the Arabs do not use the second element for nothing, and that Abu Hatim's answer 'he does not know the meaning of the word' should only be understood as the word has a meaning but he himself does not know it* (Muzhir I, 414-416).

As a matter of fact, with the exception of the above-mentioned example and three other forms (namely 'aṣṣān naṣṣān, 'aġma'ūn 'akta'un, haiyān baiyān) on which opinion divides, every single second element has its obvious meaning and etymological history and can occur alone in the language. For example, ḍā'i' "circulating, outspreading" in ṣā'i' ḍā'i', nadmān "regretful, repentant" in sadm-ān nadm-ān, yabābu "ruined" in ḥarābu yabābu, and so forth. All have been in use as independent words throughout the history of the language.

6) Abu Ali Ḳālī (Amālī II, 216-217) tends to consider /-n/ in *basan* above a suffix like /-n/ in ḥalba-na and 'alġa-na, and he distinguishes two types of *Itbā'* depending on the signification of both elements (op.cit.: 208ff) as follows:

6a) the two elements express the same meaning and, in this case, the 2<sup>nd</sup> strengthens or confirms the meaning of the 1<sup>st</sup> as in *ṣaniy maliy*, both mean 'rich', 'aṣīru 'aṣīru, both mean 'merry, gay', ḍa'īl ba'īl, both mean 'tiny, little, growing less, waning', muḍī' muṣī', both mean 'lost'.

6b) the two elements express different meanings as in *ṣaiṭān laiṭān*, where *ṣaiṭān* signifies "Satan" and *laiṭān* "sticking to (evil)" is from lāṭa "stick to", ḍaiyiḳ laiyiḳ, where the first expresses "narrow" and the second "sticking to".

Our interest in *Itbā'* lies in the fact that the elements forming *Itbā'* are ultimately from PHS words, and that the radical consonant marking a difference between many pairs is either a proot by itself or a grammatical affix, e.g. ḥārr-un ġārr-un yārr-un each means "hot"<sup>199</sup>, 'akīk 'akīk both mean "hot" (see §2.12.25), 'aṣaḳḳu 'amaḳḳu both mean "tall/long" (see §2.10.7), and so forth.

**2.17.1** Akk. tinūru "oven, stove", OAram. tnwr, Pun. tnr id. (NWSI, II, 1224), CA tannūru, BHeb. tannūr, Soq. tennar, Meh. tennūr id. The word is perh. a compound of two stems \*tin- and \*ūru. The first part is perh. a term for 'place, ground' as in Eyp. tn(n) "ground" (EHD II, 838), CA tanna "to settle in a place" (see §2.12.20 above). The second element \*-ūru "fire" is seen in Akk. ūr-, urr- "to kindle, shine (light, fire), BHeb. 'ōr "to shine"; he'īr "to kindle, set on fire", CA 'auwara "to kindle"; 'uwwāru "flame, intense heat (of fire, of the sun)", Ug. 'ar "fire, light", etc. all are from a root \*'wr (DRS I, 13). This reconstructed trilateral may perfectly account for CA, Can. words as well as for Akk. ūr-, Akk. urr- and CA 'rr, Assy. urru "light" also "day" are also from this trilateral, and medial radical \*-w- > -r- due to complete assimilation: Chad. Sumray 'ura, Bid 'oor, Dangla 'ere "be hot", Bambala orra "midday", Gudu wūr "morning", Cush.: Afar ur- "to burn" (HSED, n. 136, 137).

1) It seems that [ʾwr] is related to [wry] as in CA warā, CIV 'aurā "to kindle a fire";

<sup>199</sup> For [ḥr], see §3.2.32 above, for [ġr], see §2.2.4 above, and for [war > yar], see §2.17.1 below.

riyya-tu (\*riwya-tu) “ember or lighter or anything used to kindle a fire”: Egyp. wr “fire, flame” Chad.: Buduma yir-ow “heat”, Boghom yar “burn”, Dangla yere id, Zime wor “to roast” (see §2.5.4 above). The three trilaterals \*’wr, \*’wry, and \*’rr are ultimately from one single root.

2) A fourth related trilateral is [’ry] Phoen. ’ry “to burn”; ’rt “hearth” (PG, 81), Pun. ’rh id. (NWSI I, 104), BHeb. ’rh in the compound ’arī’ēl “hearth or altar of God” (OT, 84) = CA ’araya, Class II ’arrā “to flame up a fire”; ’ira-tu = Phoen. ’rt in meaning.

3) Due to the frequent interchange of /’/ and /’/. A fifth member of the same family is CA s’r, with caus. s-, = Egyp. s-’r (see §2.2.56.3). The change of /’/ to /’/ is perfectly justifiable as far as CA is concerned because the addition of prefixed caus. /s-/ to \*’ar-creates a sequence of sounds impossible to pronounce: CI \*sa’ara “to kindle a fire, flame up a fire; CII \*sa’ara, CIV \*’as’ara “cause to kindle a fire”; \*sa’iru “blazing or glowing of fire, hell”. In all such words, medial /’/ after s- *must become* /’/, and this what has happened.

4) One may argue, however, that the compound {tnwr} above may be divided into \*tin- plus \*nūru, from r. [nwr], or, as some old Arab grammarians assert, into prefixed t- plus \*nūru. In accordance with this view, the word conforms to the rare stem {taFġūLu}. A view strongly rejected by Ibin Jinni (Khaṣā’iṣ II, 50). The second part \*nūru is seen in Oakk. nwr “to shine” (Gelb, 1961: 179), CA nūru “light”; nāru “fire”; CIV ’anāra “to shine”, Tham. nwr “light, shine” (Branden, 1950: 515), Ug. nyr “to shine”, nr “lamp” (UG: 535), Phoen. nr “lamp, light” (PG, 123), BHeb. nwr “to shine”, BAram. nwr, Syr. nūrā “fire” (OT, 660), Cush.: Proto-Southern Cush. \*ḡûr- “flare, blaze”, Chad.: ḡurj “embers”, West Chad. \*nrj “ashes” (RPAA, n. 641). It is also seen in Egyp. m’nr’t “beacon-tower” (EHD I, 274) = CA ma-nāra-tu fem. “lighthouse, beacon”, consisting of ma- “place” and nwr “light”.

5) Gesenius (OT, 1111) considers the word {tnwr} a compound of \*tn- “oven; smoke” and [nwr]. The first part \*tn- is seen in BAram. and Syr. tnn “to smoke”, CA ’attūnu (does not sound Arabic to me), pl. ’atātīn “fire-place, furnace” (the pl. form sounds Arabic). For the true CA cognate and the origin of [tn], see *Comments* II below.

6) My chief objection to Old Arab scholars and Gesenius’ hypotheses here advanced would be that kindred trilaterals beginning with /nw-/ have nothing to do with “to burn; heat, fire, flame, smoke, and the like”. They express a general idea “to swing, move, turn” as in CA nwd, nwt, nws, nwḥ, nwš, nwṭ, nwḏ, nwġ, nwb, nw’, etc. see LA; BHeb. nwd “to move up and down, to and fro”, nwṭ “be moved, to quake”, nws “to move swiftly, haste, fly”, nw’ “to nod, waver, reel, move to and fro unsteadily”, nwp “to move or wave up and down”, etc. see OT., Eth. nwṭ, nwš “to move, agitate”, etc. (HED, 120). Accordingly, it seems evident that /nw-/ is a later addition to this group of trilaterals. For the morphological function of prefixed \*n- in this word, see §2.11, n. 6 above.

#### Comments I

a) I come back to this section- after about 23 years of writing the data above, and after a close comparative study of all relevant roots signifying ‘fire’ and notions closely related to it such as ‘sun’, ‘heat’, ‘smoke’, ‘burn’, and the like, to ask myself only one logical question, which will be cited in n. c below after preparing the ground for raising

it.

b) On the basis of evidence discussed above, one may plausibly reconstruct stems \*'ur- “fire”; \*'ar- “light a fire”. The evidence presented above may justify the reconstructed stems since it centers on roots with /-r/, like ['wr], ['rr], [wry], ['ry], [w'r], [nwr], [\*s'r], and overlooks all other roots that may be related to them.

One of such related roots is CA 'anīsa-tu; ma-'nūsa-tu fem. “fire”, occurred in Poet. (Ibin Aḥmar):

«...kamā taṭāyara 'an ma-'nūsati ('a)š šararu»

To my understanding, the long vowel of the 2<sup>nd</sup> syllable is from \*/-w-/, and the word is, with infixed /-n-/, from CA ['ws]. This trilateral has been preserved in CA 'ās lit. “traces or signs pointing to the (previous) existence of fire in either a fire-place or between the usual three stones surrounding fire (called 'aṭāfi), as ashes”, i.e. *ashes clearly indicate that a fire was once kindled in a place*, as in Poet.:

«... wa suf'un 'alā 'ās-in wa nu'yun muṭa'labi» (LA)

Its cognates in HS have all lost the root radical /-w-/: Akk. 'iša-tu “fire”, Phoen. 'š, Ug. 'išṭ id., OAram. 'š, OffAram. 'šh, BAram. 'eššā “fire”, Heb. 'eš, Ge. 'əsat “fire”, Har. isāt, Te. 'əsat, Amh., E., M., Ms., Go. əsat id. (DRS I, 35; HED, 34): Chad.: Angas, Grk wus “fire”, Ankwe wuss, Krk, Ngamo yasi, Gera wusi, Glm wuši id., Birgit 'issi “fire”, Cush.: Iraqw, Gorowa, Alagwa, Burunge aša “fire” (HSED, n. 82). Semitists and Hamitosemitists wrongly reconstruct roots \*'šš- (DRS I, 35), \*'es- (HSED, n. 80), etc. The true surface root is \*'aθ-.

c) I ask myself this logical and weighty question, if, for example, ['wr] and ['ws] are ultimately from \*'ar- and \*'aš- (actually \*'aθ-) respectively, what would be the ultimate origin of ['wm] as in CA 'iyyāmu (from 'uwwāmu) “smoke (of fire), heat of thirst” = Egyp. 'm, 'mwt “flame, fire”, y'm (caus.) “to set fire to, to kindle”, w'm “to be hot, to burn” (EHD I, 146), Chad.: Ngama yam “hot” (HSED, n. 72)? Should it be considered from a third proot \*'am-?

The naked truth is that all triliterals discussed above and so many others are no more than mere derivatives of one single proot ['au- or 'aw-], and that this primeval proot has been preserved intact in Egyp. 'w-t “rays of light” with variants y' “to burn; flame, fire”, w' “to burn, be hot”, w'w', w'-t “flame, fire”, Eth.: Ge. wə'ya “to burn, be hot”, Tna. wā'ayā “be hot”, Amh. wa'əy, Har. wəy “heat”, Ed. wi'yä “hot”, Gour. wi'ä “be hot”, E., Gt. wina “hot” (HED, 162; DRS VII, 576).

d) The most ancient causative form of this proot has also been preserved in CA su'ā [s-'aw-] “fire” (LA) as in the Koran: (ثم كانت عاقبة الذين أسأوا السوأى): Chad.: Mwulyen uwo “to roast”, Mofu waw “fire, heat”, Mandara awaw id., Sumray wa “to toast”, Tum woi “be hot”, Cush.: Agaw wa- “be hot, burn” (HSED, 520), also in some South Cush. dialects wa'u “smoke” (RPAA, n. 986). To this ancient proot also belong with suffixed /-t/: Chad.: Housa wutā “fire”, Tangale wəti, Geji wutu, Burma, Sayanchi, Kir wut, Tala wudi, Gebin wəte, Gaa wəta, Tera wəti id. (HSED, n. 1187).

e) The natural and expected interchange of /' / and /' / would give rise to some variant proots with /'-/. One of such variants is \*'aw-g as in Egyp. 'wg “to roast”, Chad.: Ndam woga, Kwang wage, Dangla ogiye, Tumak waag “to roast, burn” (HSED, n. 1078).



## Comments II

In going back to n. 5 above, we find that the exact CA cognate is *ʿuθānu* or *ʿaθana* “smoke”, perh. orig. “great smoke”, a compound of [*ʿu*] *great, large*, etc. see §2.14 above, and the word *\*ʿaθan* = Aram. *tnn* above is from *\*ʿtn* = BHeb. *ʿāšān* “smoke” ~ *ʿšn* “obscurity, darkness”. The CA pl. form of *ʿuθānu* is *ʿawāθinu*, which is one of two pl. stems found in the language (LA). The form of the pl. tells that the word is from *\*ʿu* + *\*ʿaw-θ* (= *ʿiš-* “fire” above) + the determiner *-n*.

**2.17.2** OAram. *ʿwr* “to blind” (NWSI II, 834), Ug. *ʿwr id.* (UG: 531), BHeb. *ʿiwwer id.*, CA *ʿaʿwaru* “blind of one eye”; *ʿawira* “to lose one’s eye”, *ʿauwara* “make blind of one eye”, etc.

1) In Aram. and Can. and all other sister languages the form simply expresses “blind (unspecified)”, whereas in CA the form, together with some other derivatives of [*ʿwr*], centers round the notion “one eye being blind”. *Which of these two significations represent the earliest situation in the HS family?*

2) As in every similar case of study, the moment I wrote down CA *ʿaʿwaru* “one with one eye” with the purpose of studying it, it came immediately to my mind a number of other terms denoting similar, though not identical, meanings. I have chosen *ʿaḥwalu* “one with crossed-eyed” to elaborate on and identify its historical evolution with that of *ʿaʿwaru*.

PHS had a proot *\*-R-* “eye”, later “see”, where *\*-R-* = *-r-* ~ *-l-*. Both variants may appear as *\*raʿ* ~ *\*ʿar-* and *\*laʿ* ~ *\*ʿla-*. For *\*raʿ*, see §§2.7.11; 2.7.31; 3.10.11, etc. above. As for *\*ʿar-*: Egyp. *ir-t* “eye”, Chad.: Polchi, Sayanchi *yir* “eye”, Lame *iri*, Banana *ira*, Mubi *ir-in id.* As a verb: Sumray *yēro* “to see”, Sibine *yara id.*, Bed. *re id.*, Ometo *ʿer* “to know”, Iraqw *ara* “to see”, Alagwa *ar- id.*, etc. (HSED, n. 112, 75; RPAA, n. 720).

For [*\*ʿal-* ~ *\*ʿlaʿ-*]: Cush.: Som. *il* “eye”, *ilaali* “to watch”, Oromo *ila* “eye”; *ilaala-* “to look”, Sid. *illee* “eye”, Hadiya *illi*, Bil. *ʿil*, *ʿel*, Xamta *əl*, Geleba *iil*, Kemant *yil*, Dembea *il id.*, Saho *ilaal* “to wait”, Afar *ilal* “to look”, Chad.: Buduma *yel*, *yil* “eye”, Gulfey *el*, Lamang *ili id.*, Migama *ʿello* “to look”, Mokilko *woll id.* (HSED, n. 1101, 1090). The verb form is also seen in Cush.: Sid. *laʿ* “sehen”, Had., Kam. *laʿ* “wissen” (Müller, 1975: 70, n. 84).

To sum up, Sem. [*ʿwr*] is a compound of [*ʿaw*] and *\*-r-* and [*ḥwl*] is a compound of [*ḥaw*] and *\*-l-*. Both [*ḥaw*] and [*ʿaw*] express similar meanings (see §2.1.14.3, n. 1 & 4 above). Since these two biradical serve as stems from which so many traditional roots have been developed, it may necessary to explain the major semantic difference between them. To my understanding, [*ḥaw*] = “turning, changing the natural position of a thing without damaging it”, Sab. *ḥwy* “to encircle, to invest” (SD, 74), Egyp. *ḥ* “round”, CA *ḥawā* “to enclose, surround”, ta-*ḥawwā* “to twist, coil, as a serpent”, *ḥawalu* “a change in the natural position of the eye”, CII *ḥauwala* “to change, turn round/aside, shift, switch off anything, e.g. *destination of a plane, direction of traffic, flow of river, one’s direction*, and the like, a compound of *\*ḥaw* + prep. [*l*] = to, hence prep. *ḥaulu* “round, around”, etc. The stem [*ʿaw*] is often associated with “inflicting damage on”<sup>200</sup>.

<sup>200</sup> CA *ʿawā* “to bend, curve, make crooked, distort”, BHeb. *ʿwh Piel.* “to subvert, overturn”; *Niph.* “be distorted, bowed down, bent; writhe”; *Hiph.* “make crooked, pervert”, (OT, 757).

3) Finally, one may object to the analysis of [ʿwr] as given above and propose a compound of [ʿw] “one” and [ʿar] “eye”, both proots are found in both Egyp. and CA. In the light of the fact that only one of the two analyses must be correct, some important questions rise here, *which one of the two reflects the earliest situation? How can we determine with certainty the correct one? Is there an empirical method that can be used for this purpose?* Such questions are easy to answer with certainty so long as the results of our method can be publically verified or refuted.

Like ‘the eye’, some other parts of the body come in *pairs* such as *leg, hand, ear*, etc. Take, for example, the term for “leg”, which appears in compounds as \*rg, \*gr (rare \*lg, or \*gl) and add to it [ʿaW]. If the resulting combination expresses “one leg, one legged man”, then [ʿaW] stands for ‘one’. Otherwise, it stands for “damaged, twisted, and the like”:

3a) CA ʿa-ʿrâg “lame, in the sense *having one leg impaired*, i.e. *it does function well as the other leg*”, Palm. ʿrg “the lame” (NWSI II, 886), etc.

3b) Similarly, OffAram. ḥgyr “lame” (NWSI I, 348), Syr. ḥgr id. = CA ḥarġala-tu fem. id. (SL ḥalaž = *a degree of lameness less than ʿrġ*, in CA *walking very slowly*). For HS rgl “foot, leg”, see §2.25, n. 5 below.

4) To my knowledge, there are three CA words in which a surface trilateral [rgl] is kept in compounding:

i) farġala-tu fem. = faḥġu, faġaġu “legs are relatively far from each other”: see §2.11.38 above. For proot [fa-] “apart”, see §§2.8.18 above & 2.17.12 below.

ii) ʿarġala “on foot”: [ʿa-], a reduced form of gen. Sem. ʿal “on, over, above, etc.

iii) The quadrilateral ḥrġl may be variant of ʿrġl or a compound consisting of ḥar “on” (< ḥar) “on” plus rgl “foot”. For this reduced form of ḥar, see §2.11.7, *the last paragraph* of ft. <sup>1</sup> above. This prep. is seen in Egyp. ḥr “upon” (EG. §165).

It is worth noting that SL and other dialects have krž (< krġ) “a kind of walking” as a vb karaž “walk (like a bird)”. For ka-, see §2.17.83 below.

**2.17.3** CA raġulu \*“(master, lord)”, later “man”, ESA rgl “period of office”, Aram. s-rgl “to rule”, Palm. rgl “man” (see §2.7.10, n. b above), perh. from a compound of stem \*rag- “man” as in Cush.: Ga. raga “prophet”, Som. reg “man”, CA raġa- “friend, comrade”, and \*ʿl- “God”, i.e. ultimately ‘a man’. The original meaning of the compound is “man of God”. A similar compound is Hatra mrlh’ “lord of all the gods”, from mr’ “master, lord” and ʿlh “god”, pl. ʿlh’ (NWSI II, 693).

The idiomatic expression *lā ġā wa lā sā* refers to “a man of one hundred years old”, lit. (he is) *neither a man nor a woman*: *lā...lā* “neither ... nor”, *ġā* “man”, *wa* “and”, *sā* “woman” (Al ʿAyn II, 123-124). There is no doubt that *ġā* is related to PHS [gaW] (§3.12.40, n. 4, under *Comments*, above), and *sā* to CA ni-sā’ (see §2.23.10, n. 2 below). The word *ġā* is also seen in a number of compounds, one of which is in §2.17.6, n. 1b below. It is possible that both words refer orig. to ‘male’ and ‘female’ respectively.

#### Comments

Saying that *an old man* is *neither a man nor a woman* actually means that *he is lacking the physical strength and vigor attributed to a man* and that *he does possess the*

*feminine qualities and characteristics attributed to a female.* Now, a revolutionary question may rise: *Is [rag] a proot or a compound?* I believe that the word is a compound of \*raW- “human being” (Egyp. r, etc. id.) plus \*-ġa-, from \*ga’- “great”, applies to ‘man’ (§2.2.29 above).

**2.17.4** Akk. bālu “to implore”, CA bahala “to beg God, call God”; CVIII ’ibtahala “to implore (usu. God)”, Ge. bəhla, Tna. bālā, Te. belā “to say” (DRS II, 48), are from a compound of \*bah- “to beg, call” (see §2.13.24, *Comments* III below) and \*’il- “God” above.

**2.17.5** Ug. bnš “man”, Eth. be’esī id. (Rabin, 1975: 88; UG, 534) = CA ba’su “might, strength”: for the relation between ‘man’ and ‘strength’: comp. OAram. gbr “man” with Akk. gabru “strong”, Lat vir “man” is from vīs “strength”, etc. All are from a compound of two roots \*bn-’yš, expressing “son of human being”, i.e. *man*. The first element of the compound is seen in Akk., CA binu, Ug. bn “son”, and the second element in OAram., Moab., Phoen. ’š “man”, OffAram. ’š, ’yš, Palm. ’yš, etc. id. (NWSI I, 115ff), BHeb. ’tš id., Sab.’ys “man” (SD, 10): CA ’ys “to be, exist” (§2.21.2.1 below).

1) For a compound formed from the same elements: cf. Aram. barnāšā “human being” is from Aram. bar “son” and ’nš “man” (> CA obsol. barnašā), and for a compound formed from dissimilar elements: cf. OAram. brg’yh lit. “son of majesty” (br “son” and g’yh “majesty”: see §2.2.29 above), Eth. *ēgwāla-emma-ḥēyāw* “human being”, lit. *son of the mother of the living* (Rabin, 1975: 88, n. 64). In CA or SL a phrase like *naġlu ’ummi* (’a)l-ḥayā-t “human being”, lit. *son of the mother of the living*, sounds strange or new, but will be easily understood. This example does not imply any suggestion that Eth. and CA words for “son, human being” are direct cognates. Similar compounds are BHeb. *bidkar* Bidkar, pers. name, from *ben baḳar* “son of stabbing, i.e. stabber (OT, 114), *binyāmīn* Benjamin, i.e. *son of the right hand*, *bimhāl* Bimhal = *son of circumcision*, i.e. *circumcised* (OT, 139), *birša’* Birsha’ *son of wickedness*, i.e. *bin + reša’*, etc.

2) Similar compounds are found in CA as in *biyya-tu* “son of adultery”, it is also said: *’ibin ḡaiya-tu* “son of adultery”, where *’ibin* or *bin* = “son” and *ḡaiya-tu* “adultery, adulterer (fem.)” (LA). In Egyp. the two words often remain separate as in *s’ ḥmm* “son of fever”, i.e. *a fever patient* (CA ḥmm “heat, fever”), *s’ rp’t* “son of a chief” (= CA *rif’a-tu* “sublimity, highness”).

3) As one may note, the compound [bn’š] underwent some phonological changes in the Semitic languages above. In Ug. the initial /’-/ of /’yš/ was assimilated to the preceding /n/, perhaps becoming first \*bn-nš, later, with the loss of /-n-/, bn-š. In CA and perhaps also in Eth. the sequence /\*bn’s/ is not a phonotactic possibility and as a result /n/ is bound to disappear.

**2.17.6** Moab. ’r’l, military term denoting *more than one person* (NWSI I, 100) = CA *ra’la-tu* “a group of horsemen about 20, a group of 20 horsemen forming the front of army” (LA), pl. *ri’ālu*, pl. of the pl. may be *’arā’lu*.

1) The most widely used form of the trilateral [r’l] throughout the history of the language is *ra’l* coll. “generation, i.e. *belonging to the same period of time*”. Its final [-

īl] is, to my understanding, linguistically identical with that of CA *gīl* “generation, i.e. *belonging to the same age*” = BHeb. *gīl* “an age, generation; men of an age” (OT, 191), Sab. *gyl* “period, course of a season” (SD, 52), Har. *gēl* “companion”, Cush.: Ga. *gēle* “friend” (HED, 70).

1a) The trilateral [r’l] is a compound of \*ra’- and \*-īl. The first element is seen in Akk. ru’ū, EHeb. r’w, OffAram. r’h “friend, colleague” (NWSI II, 1078-1079), Ug. r’ “companion” (UG, 531), Phoen. r’ “friend, companion”, Chad.: Dangla “roya friend, husband”, Mubi ro id.: comp. with [r] in §2.11.48 below.

1b) The trilateral [gyl] is a compound of ga’-, gaw- (or giw-) as in Akk. ga’-, gaw- “people”, BHeb. *gōy* “people, nation”, Phoen., Pun. gw “community” (DRS II, 107; OT, 184), Sab. gw “community group” (SD, 51), Chad.: Angas go “man”, Krk. *ṅgā*, Ngamo *ṅgō* id., Bidiya gee- “friend” (HSED, n. 906).

1c) As to the second element of the compound in both words, it cannot be from ’il- “God” *at all*. It may be from either ’āl “family”, etc. (see §2.1.14.2 above) or (much less likely) “period of time”.

1d) The signification of the first element of both compounds must have expressed “youth, children, young people, and the like”.

2) A different HS stem [ra’-] is seen with various extensions and signifies “to thunder, frighten, tremble” (§2.12.27 above).

**2.17.7** EAram., BAram., Syr., Jp. *gḥn*, NHeb. *gāḥan* “to incline, to bend”, BHeb. *gāḥōn* “the belly of reptiles”, *so called from its bent or curved form* (OT, 478; DRS II, 113) are cognates with SL *ḡaḥā* (i.e. *ḡaḥā*), usu. followed by a word for ‘self’ like *ḥālu* “himself”, “to incline”; *minḡḥī* on a mattress = *inclining* + *stretching*. To this proot belongs CA *ḡaḥḥa*- “be pregnant”, said of a bitch or lioness.

On the other hand, CA *ḡuḥḥu* *anything*- like types of plants and trees- which stretches out or extends on the face of the earth”, in Old Yemen *gaḥḥa* “to drag” = CA CVII *’inḡaḥḥa* id., from “stretch out” (LA).

Semitic [gḥn] above is clearly from a proot [ga-] (see §2.17.83 below) and a stem [ḥan] “bend, incline” (§2.2.51 above).

**2.17.8** CA *maḥādu* = “ford”, i.e. *a place in a body of water where crossing can be made on foot*, from *ḥawdu* “walking in or through water”, a compound of \*ḥw- “empty (shallow, lacking depth) + \*-d- “water”. For the first element, see §2.16 above and for the second, see §2.11.29, n. 9b above.

**2.17.9** Akk. *salāku* “to go up”, OAram., OffAram., Palm. *slḵ* id. (NWSI II, 788-790), BHeb., BAram. *slḵ* “to go up, ascend” (OT, 726), CA *salāka* “to climb, ascend (a mountain)”, CV *tasallāka* “to climb (a mountain). All are from a self-explained compound of stem \*sal- and \*-ḵ-<sup>201</sup>. The latter signifies “mountain”, while the former denotes to “ascend” as in BHeb. *sālal* “to lift up, to raise; to cast up into a heap” (OT, 725), etc. The root is also seen with m-ext. in Phoen. *slmt* “stairs” (NWSI II, 788), Heb.

<sup>201</sup> Comp. with the root discussed in §2.2.25 above.

sullām “stair-case, ladder”, CA sullamu id., pl. salālimu.

To PHS stem sal- also belong with various extensions such trilaterals as in BHeb. [slʾ], [slh] “to lift, raise, esp. *to suspend a balance*”, \*slʾ obsol. perh. “be elevated, be high”, hence *selaʾ* “a rock”. Gesenius (OT, 725) sees that Heb. *selaʾ* is «*not found in the kindred dialects; but comp. Sanscr. ṣilā rock. Lat. silex-s*». Cognates are actually found in kindred languages, but the analyst has to be aware of all types of sound changes that Semitic languages have undergone in the course of time. In taking into account rules I and II and their implications (see §2.2.48 above), we can confidently state that the exact CA cognate is ṣullaʾu “stone”; ṣullāʾu pl. “a large rock”, fem. sg. ṣullāʾa-tu, and perh. Sab. sʾlʾ “quarry stone” (SD, 138).

**2.17.10** CA ḡaflu or ḡiflu “elephant dung” is a compound of two elements: a proot \*gW- “dung, filth” and a stem \*flu-, i.e. *fīlu*, as in CA fīlu, Akk. pīlu, pīru “elephant” (VPHS, 170, n. 372). The proot \*gW- is found in CA giwāʾu and in Egyp. kʾi-t “cow” also “dung, filth”: kʾ, kʾi ~ gʾ “bull”, Copt. ko id. (EHD II, 748ff, 800), Chad.: Tum guūy “bull”, Gava kawa, Mandara kawa id., etc. (HSED, n. 905, 1399). The term for “elephant dung” is *rauṯu* or *ḡaʾlu* and it seems that the original meaning of CA \*gi-/ga- is “(cow) dung”: cf. CA wa-gīʾa-tu fem. “cow”, ḡawā “be filthy”; CIV ʾaḡwā “make filthy” as in the PIP of Labid:

«*nasaʾta binīʾihā wa ḡawai-ta ʾanhā*  
wa ʾindī law ʾardta lahā dawāʾu» (Al ʾayn VI, 197).

a) Another CA compound word containing the word *fīlu* is *dayʾalu* “young (lit. ‘son’) of elephant” (ML II, 341) is a compound of \*day- and \*falu-. A possible meaning of \*day- is “suckling, offspring”. As for \*falu-, it is from *fīlu*.

b) A *third* word containing the same element is *ḡandaḡilu* “with a large/big head”, i.e. *head like an elephant*. The first element of the compound \*ḡanda is from ḡaddu, with the first \*-d- dissimilating to /-n-/: PHS \*ḡad- “head” as in Akk. ḡaḡḡadu “head” (AG, 96), Ug. ḡdḡd id. (UG, 533). For dissim., see §2.17.80 below.

c) A *fourth* word possibly including the same element is *zandabīlu* “elephant”, with voicing of \*-p-. The origin of initial /z-/ is difficult to determine. Suppose it is from \*g-, then the original meaning of the compound will be “a group of elephants” and, in this case, the /-n-/ is an infix.

It is indeed surprising to find so many special terms having to do with ‘elephant’ in the language, such as *ḡaurānu* “hide of elephant”, *ḡirṣiyānu* “inner hide of elephant”, *ḡafʾu* “excrement or filth of an elephant”, *ṯaḡu* “dung of elephant when it is liquid”, *ḡaʾlu* “dung of elephant”, *ʾasīlu* “penis of elephant”, *ʾarūnu* “brain of elephant”, *finʾīlu*<sup>202</sup> “neck of an elephant”, *kalṯūmu* “elephant”, orig. either a descriptive term for

<sup>202</sup> The term *finʾīlu* may be from \*finʾīlu become finʾīlu for ease of pronunciation: cf. CA fināʾu as in fināʾu ʾal-bayti “front (i.e. face) of the house” = BHeb. pny “figure, devan” (VPHS, 371, n. 380), Assy. pānu “face” (King, 1898: 376), Ug. pn-m id. (UG, 532).

its face or from ‘fleshy’ (to my understanding, however, the word is *fem.*), ‘*aiθūmu* “female elephant”, ‘*aḡarṭalu* id., and so forth

**2.17.11** As pointed out in §2.16.14, n. c, d, e above, there seems to be a connection between ‘create’ and ‘dig, bore’. One of the most common trilaterals expressing “to dig” is [ḥpr] as in Akk. ḥapāru, CA ḥafara “to dig”, Mand. hpr id. (MD, 151), EHeb., OffAram., Palm., JAram. ḥpr “to dig” (NWSI I, 396) id., Sab. ḥfr “to dig” (SD, 66). To this root belong, among others, CA ḥufra-tu “hole, cavity” also “grave”, Chad.: Tangale, Pero pur “tomb” (HSED, n. 1239).

In accordance with the above-mentioned view, we should identify the Semitic root with Egyp. ḥpr “to create, produce, exist, be, bring into being, similitude, to transform oneself”; ḥpr “the beetle-god and the sacred beetle itself, the Creator of the world” (EHD I, 542-543); (yri) ḥprw “(to effect) transformations” (EHD I, 66).

There is, of course, another weighty reason for the identification. In some CA proverbs, in *Hadith* and in the Koran (Al ‘ayn III, 212; LA, etc.) the signification of some traditional derivatives of [ḥfr] approaches those of Egyp., for example, CA ḥāfira-tu fem. = “first, first creation” also “taking s.o. or s.t. backward in the course of time to first creation” as in this verse of Ibin A‘rābi:

«’aḥāfiratun ‘alā ṣala’in wa ṣaibin  
ma’āḍa’allāhi min safahin wa ‘āri».

In *Hadith*: «’inna haḍā (’a)l ‘amr lā yutrak ‘alā ḥālihi ḥattā yuradda ‘alā, and in the Koran: (يقولون أئنا لمردون في الحافة), *they will say (then): shall we indeed be restored/brought back to as (we were) at first* (79:10). Koranic ḥāfira- denotes, according to Farrā’, “back (in time) to our first life”, according to Ibin A‘rābi, “back (in time) to the world life as we were (before death)”, and according to some others “back (in time) to the first creation before death” (LA). The same idea is expressed in the Koran with a phrase {ḥalḡ (= creation) + ‘awwal (= first or former)}: (أفيعينا بالخلق الأول), *Were we then wearied out with the first creation?* (50: 15).

The trilateral in question, just like any other trilateral, consists of a number of proots: \*ḥay- “life; live” as in CA, Ug. etc. ḥy-t id. and a stem \*pir- “first, former” (see §2.2.13, n. 3 above).

To my understanding, the trilateral ḥpr “to dig” is so closely connected with “earth” and for this reason it cannot be connected with Egyp.-CA [ḥpr].

**2.17.12** CA ta-faṣṣā “to rid oneself of, be saved; deliver” (ŠHH VI, 2455), EHeb. pṣy “to rid (someone of), deliver”, Hatra, pṣy “to rescue”, BAram., Syr. pṣy “to deliver” (NWSI II, 930; OT, 860-861). This is a compound of [fa’] “separate; apart” + \*ṣaW “binding”. The elements of the compound have already been seen in see §2.12.1 above, and for [fa’] also see §§2.8.18, esp. n. & 2.17.2, n. i above.

**2.17.13** Tham. fṣḥ “purity” (Branden, 1950: 517), CA faṣaḥa “become pure (of sheep’s milk), clear (of urine)”; faṣāḥa-tu “eloquence”; afṣaḥa “be clear, evident”; fuṣḥā “characterized by eloquence and clarity” (hence ‘*Classical Arabic*’), BHeb. and Syr. pṣḥ “to break forth into joy” (OT, 861), Mand. pṣiha “bright, clear, cheerful” (MD, 376):

PHS stem \*šaḥ-, see §2.11.37 & 2.12.24 above.

The signification of faṣaḥa gives a real clue to the original meaning of \*f- in this trilateral and in many other compound trilaterals. When a sheep gives birth, its milk is referred to as *liba'* (SL libā), which is white in color but different from milk in taste. Thus, when the period of *liba'* is over, one can use *faṣaḥa* “become pure (milk)”, i.e. *the milk becomes pure exactly as it was before the period of ‘giving birth’*. Similarly, *faṣaḥa*, said of urine, “become clear”, e.g. *today or right now, but yesterday or few days or hours ago the urine was possibly mixed with blood or it was reddish*, etc. For further detail, see LA.

The foregoing illustrations make it clear that the meaning of *faṣaḥa* is composite of the meanings of its two parts: a proot [fa-] and a stem [šaḥ] “pure, clear”. We may note that the compound signifies more than the idea expressed by its parts. Besides “pure, clear”, the word has accrued one additional semantic feature implying that ‘it was not pure/clear an hour/day/week/year, etc. ago’. Thus the meaning of [fa-] is *definitely “(something) returning to its former state, position, habit, or course of life”* and is related to [faW] in §2.7.12 above. Also see §2.17.14 below.

The proot is certainly a reduced form of \*faW- “return or go back (to a former state, etc. above)” as in the Koran: (فَإِنْ فَآوَا فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ غَفُورٌ رَحِيمٌ), (For those who swear to abstain from their wives, are ordained a waiting for four months) *and if they then go back* (from their oath) *then verily God is Oft-Forgiving, the Most Merciful* (2: 226). This special meaning distinguishes the word *fā'a* from many other words expressing “to return” like *raġi'a*, *'āda*, *'āba*, *ṯāba*, etc. Thus when we say: Someone is *sarī'u* (= quick [in]) *'al* (= the) *fai'i* (= returning) *min* (= from) *yaḍabi-hi* (= his anger), *we mean that he is quick in returning or coming back to his former characteristic state of peacefulness before getting angry*. The fixed expression is quoted from Ahmad Bin Faris' ML IV, 436 and is found in Al 'Ayn VIII, 407

**2.17.14** We have already seen in §2.11.35 above that CA *sulāla*-tu denotes “progeny, descendants”. By suffixing /-f/ to \*sul-, we get a trilateral [slf] signifying, as in *salafu*, “ancestors, forefathers”.

What is the difference between a ‘*descendant*’ and ‘*ancestor*’? The difference lies only in the notion of ‘*time*’. We are descendants of our ancestors, who were in turn descendants of their ancestors, and so forth, with varying degrees of remoteness. Any one whom we now call a ‘*descendant of...*’, will be an ‘*ancestor of*’ (his grandsons’ progeny) in due time. Thus:

*“descendant + past (time)” = ancestor.*

The meaning of the compound *salafu* is a combination of the meanings of its two parts a stem [sul] “descendant” and \*-p “afore-, past”, the significations of some derivatives are: *sālifu* “former, previous, foregoing”; *salafa* “be past, to precede or be before in past time” as in the Koran 5: 95, 8: 38, 10: 30, 69: 24.

We have claimed above that the meaning of \*-p is “past, afore-” without presenting any piece of evidence to support the claim. As we know, Semitic \*šan- designates “year” as in CA *sana*-tu fem., OCan., Phoen., EBHeb., OAram., OffAram., Palm., Hatra. šn-h (NWSI II, 1170ff). Take the CA word and suffix to it [-f], the combination yields a

trilateral [snf] as in *ma-sānifu* pl. Poet. “droughty years”. Ibin Sidihi says: «*the use of the plural form (here) is a way to make the word sound dreadful or shocking*» (see LA, r. snf). When we say “*droughty years*” as a stated fact, we simply mean ‘years’ that we read about or we witnessed in the past and suffered from their effects. It is true that one can say: *the next tens years will be droughty*, but this is a general prediction. Moreover, in the verse of poetry we have just mentioned, the word is preceded by the CA word for “droughty” «...*wa hiya maḥlun masānifu*»: *wa* (= and) *hiya* (= they are) *maḥlun* (= droughty) *masānifu* (?). If the word *masānifu* expresses “droughty years”, then why should he use the word *maḥlu* with it? I firmly believe that [snf] is originally a compound of [san-] “year” and [-f] “past, afore-, before in time”, and that the use of *maḥlu* “droughty” is by itself evidence confirming this fact.

CA [snf] is certainly a historical cognate form of Egyp. snf “the year that is past, last year” (EHD II, 677, EG, 590), a compound of \*san- “year” = PSem. \*šan- id. and \*-f “past” = PSem. \*-p. Moreover, the proot \*-p- “past” is also noted in CA as in §2.17.13 above. Additional examples from Egyp. and CA are:

a) Egyp. [snf] is not the only compound word comprising the proot \*-p-, its word [sf] also contains this proto-proot. To determine the exact meaning of this blend, we combine the meaning of \*/s-/ in §2.10.13 above with that of \*/-f/ above.

b) Similarly, to determine the precise meaning of CA verb ’anifa and subst. ’ānifu, combine the meaning of \*(’a)n- in §2.20.7 below with that of \*-f- “afore-”, etc.

**2.17.15** Considering CA, Ug., etc. [’wl] “before in time, former, first”, etc. (see §2.1.14.2 above), the following facts should be recognized:

a) The trilateral underlying [’wl] may be [\*wwl, \*w’l, \*’wl, or \*wly].

b) Old Arab scholars have conflicting views on the etymology of ’auwalu. Some derive it from [’wl], some others from [w’l], and still others from [wwl] (Al ’Ayn VIII, 368; ML I, 158f; LA r. w’l; ŞHH V, 1838, etc.). One of the meanings of this compound trilateral is “past, last; before” as in Poet.:

«...mā ḍākā ṯuflan munḍu ’āmin ’awwali».

PIP Antarah says:

«...’ādātu ḵaumī fī (’a)z zamāni (’a)l ’awwalī».

c) Sem. [’wl] is a compound of perh. [’aw-] “one” and \*-Wal- “past, afore” and the original meaning of the trilateral is ‘one *aforetime*’. Jawhari (ŞHH ibid.) correctly derives ’awwalu from \*’aw’alu, and he cites as evidence the plural form ’awā’ilu, with a variant ’awālī (by metathesis). Evidence proving that \*-l- in [’wl] originally meant “former” is based on another plural form of the word: ’awwalūn as in ’abā’u-nā (’a)l ’awwalūn “our forefathers” (= ’abā’u-nā (’a)l ’aḵdamūn id.). The plural ’awā’ilu can also convey the same sort of meaning as in Poet. (’Urwa Bin ’al Ward):

«...wa ’abnā’u ’awfīn fī (’a)l ḵurūni (’a)l ’awā’ilu».

A striking similarities between [’w-l] and [ḵd-m] has attracted my attention (see §2.19.4 below). One may note that both \*-l and \*-m express “former, previous”. For bound proot -m “former, past”, see §2.22, esp. n. 5c below.

Proot \*-l is seen in Akk. amašli (see NWSI I, 89, under ’snl) = CA ’ams “yesterday”, Heb. ’emeš id., etc. (for the compound ’ams, see §2.10.13 above), where CA-Heb.



words seem to have lost this earlier \*-l-. All are from a compound of at least three proots [mu] “time of”, [suy] “evening” (§2.10.13 above), and \*wal “afore, ago”.

The very same \*-l- is doubtless present in Akk. itimāli ~ timāli ~ ina timāli “yesterday”, OffAram. ’tml id., BHeb. ’etmōl “aforetime, of old, *spoken of time long past*, yesterday”, BAram., Syr. ’tml “yesterday”, Talm. ’tml, Targ. ’tml, Mand. ’tmal id., Ge. təmaləm, Amh. təlant, C. tərāma id. (MD, 358; NWSI I, 136; HED, 148). CA: SL (’i)tlūla, used only in a fixed phrase (’i)mbērḥ (i)tlūla “the day before yesterday”, where the 1<sup>st</sup> element is from CA ’al bārīḥa-tu “yesterday”. Other common terms expressing the same idea are ’awalams (= CA ’awwal (min) ’ams id., lit. *the first* (or former) *from yesterday*) and ’awwal (’i)mbērīḥ, i.e. lit. *day before* (or former from) *yesterday*. The term in question is now rarely heard, and the two other terms are both used interchangeably. It is also to be noted that (’i)tlūla *is never used alone or in any context other than the above-mentioned*.

**2.17.16** Akk. šapāru “to twitter”, CA šafara “to whistle; twitter, chirp”, BHeb. šāpar “to twitter, chirp, as small birds”; šippor, Syr. šeppra “bird”, JAram., BAram. špr “bird” (MD, 394, OT, 902f), Ug. špr “a kind of bird” (UG, 531), CA šuffāriya-tu fem. “a kind of bird” (SL siffariyyē “a yellow bird”), Pun., OffAram. špr “bird” (NWSI II, 973). The trilateral is a compound of \*šw-<sup>203</sup> “to emit a sound, chirp” (see §2.21.3.4 below) and a word \*pur- “bird; to fly” as in CA furfuru “a small bird”; furfūru “a bird”, etc., Meh. farr “to fly”, Shh. ferfir “wing”, Berb. fer “wing”, ferfer “to flutter” (of birds), Cush.: Bed. bir “to fly”, fir “to flee”, Ag., Bilim. fir y id. (VPHS, n. 366).

**2.17.17** CA raṣfu, as defined in LA [r. rṣf] “connected things in a systemized way”. LA quotes Tahdīb (an older dictionary) as defining raṣfu “a long row of connected things”; ta-rāṣafa, said of people, “to stand up in connected line or row one next to or after another”. The term “system” used in LA’s definition is evidently = “row or line” (i.e. ṣaffu id.), raṣafa, said of stone, “put them in line one atop of another”, *as in building*; said of the road, “to pave, i.e. *to set stones into the surface at the same level*”. PIP Imri’ Al Qais says:

«...miṯālan libunyānin yuṣādu wa *yurṣafu*» (DI, p. 134, L. 4).

Assyr. raṣāpu “to fit together, build” (King, 1898: 386), Palm. rṣp “to fix, prescribe”,

<sup>203</sup> Different radicals can be suffixed to \*šp- to create additional trilaterals expressing similar meanings such as CA šafku “sound resulted from striking one thing against another”; šaffaḳa “to strike the front part of the hands together, to clap”, šaffaḥa expresses an identical meaning. However, the only difference seems to lie in ‘gender’; šaffaḳa applies to *females* and šaffaḥa to *males*. On the other hand, LA [r. ṣḥ] states: «ta-ṣḥ (said of men) is like ta-ṣḥ (said of women). To sum up, there is no *strong* evidence in the language suggesting that /-ḥ/ and /-ḳ/ make a distinction of gender.

A trilateral [špḳ] is seen in Eth. as in Ge. ’a-ṣḥaḳa “to press”, Tna., Amh. ṣāffāḳa “to crush”, Har. ṣāffāḳā “crush s.t. to change its shape” (HED, 50). The CA cognate is ṣafaḳa, CIV ’aṣḥaḳa also express “to close the door”, or more precisely, “make the two leaves of a door return to a closed condition”, with a variant ’aṣmaḳa.

in *pass.* “be attached to” (NWSI II, 1082), BHeb. *rāṣap* “to range stones artificially, to inlay a pavement or other work” (OT, 995).

The trilateral [rṣp] is clearly a compound consisting of stem [raṣ-] “fix properly” (see §§2.5.9 & 2.7.13 above) and stem [ṣaf-] as in CA *ṣaffu* “line, row”; *ṣaffa*, said of stones, “to put them in line”.

**2.17.18** HS [ṣal I]: Pun. *ṣll* “purified” (NWSI II, 968), BHeb. Syr. *ṣll*, CA *ṣalla* “to filter, clean”, Mand. *ṣll* “to be light, clear, to shine”, Ge. *ṣll* “to float, swim”. Drower and Macuch (MD, 395) considers Akk. *ṣalālu* “to lie down” as cognate. Har. *ṭālāla* “be filtered, be pure”, Tna. *’aṣlālā* “filter”, Amh. *ṭällälä* “to filter”, Gur. *ṭll* “be filtered”, Cush.: Qab. *ṭälallo* “be filtered”, Ga. *talila* “pure” (HED, 153).

a) SL *ṣwl* in CII *ṣauwal* “to filter, clean, e.g. lentils, grain by soaking in water so that the bad particles will float and will go away with the outpouring water” (= Ge. notion of “float, swim”), CA *miṣwalu* inst. “a vessel in which colocynth is soaked to get rid of bitterness”; *miṣwala-tu* also inst. “a broom”: PHS \*ḏW- as in Sab. *dyw/dyy* “clean, purified” (SD, 173). A possible CA cognate is *ṣauw* “empty”.

b) It appears that dial. [ṣwl] represents an earlier stage of [ṣll] and its medial radical /w-/ became /l-/ by progressive assimilation.

c) The real Akk. cognate is *naṣālu* “to sink”, with prefixed /n-/ becoming a part of the root.

d) HS [ṣal II]: CA *ṣalṣala* id., Syr. *ṣll* id., BHeb. *ṣālāl* “to tinkle” (OT, 894), from \*ṣw- (see §2.21.3.4 below. It is most likely that [-l] is a proot for ‘high or loud’: cf. CA *’ālī* = ‘loud’, said of sound or noise, or ‘high’, said of a mountain. It is the same [-l] in *ḡalḡal* (see §2.11.58, n. 1c above), etc.

**2.17.19** Egyp. *sn* “two”, Akk., Assyr. *šinā*, CA *’i-ṯnāni*, OSA *ṯny*, Ug. *ṯnm* “two”, BHeb. *ṣṇayim*, dual, “two” (O’Leary, 1969: 176; Moscati, 1969: §13.36), Phoen., Pun. *ṣnym*, *ṣnm* “two” (NWSI II, 1116).

1) I have my doubts about the morphological structure of CA *’iṯnāni* “two” above, the only numeral from 1-9 with the /-ān-/ ending, and also about that of BHeb.-Ug.-Phoen. *ṣn(y)m*, whose final /-m/ is likewise confined to number ‘two’. In what follows, I will attempt to examine the truth of this old philosophical saying «*Doubt is a path leading to certainty*». The focus will be on the CA numeral; BHeb.-Ug.-Phoen. /-m/ will be dealt with later. Before examining this numeral, however, it is necessary to have a general idea about PHS numeral systems.

2) An understanding of PHS numeral systems requires some rudimentary knowledge of some of those of CA. Of all Hamito-Semitic languages and dialects, CA is the only language to have preserved visible traces of all such systems. Since most of such systems are extremely complicated and so primitive, we naturally expect PHS to be much more primitive than CA.

2a) CA has a number of different numeral systems depending on the *kind* and *nature* of the thing being counted. Apart from the ordinary numerals that are common to all Semitic languages and dialects and used to count anything like *wāḥidu* (Akk. *’ēdu*) “1”, *’i-ṯnāni* (Akk. *šinā*) “2”, etc. *sab’u* (Akk. *sibu*) “7”, etc. *’ašru* (Akk. *’ešru*) “10”,

θalāθūna (Heb. šəlōšim) “30”, etc., mi’atu (Akk. me’at) “100”, etc., CA also has a number of other numeral systems. The systems which can be understood and explained are:

2b) One of which is an incomplete system of numerals for counting different animals and groups of animals as, for instance, *ḳauṭu* “100 sheep”, *hindu* “100 camels”, *baḡdu* “100 horses”, *mi-ḳnabu* “30 to 40 horses”, *ṣirma-tu* “30 camels”, *ṣad’a-tu* “about 60 camels”, *’umāma-tu* “300 camels”, *’araḡu* “300 to 400 asses”, *tiy’a-tu* fem. “40 sheep”, *kauru* “150, 200, a large number of cows”, *’akara-tu* “50 to 100, a large number of camels”, and so forth.

2c) There is also another system containing terms that denote the age of an animal. The numerals range from *one* to *eight* or to *ten* and are often accompanied with a term for the period from *eight* or *ten* until death. One example may be *ḳāriḥu* “5 year-old horse”, *ḡaḏ’u* “5 year-old beast of burden”, *sadīsu* “5 year-old sheep” (comp. *sitta* “six”; *sādīsu* “sixth”, gen Sem. id.), *ṣālīyu* ~ *sālīyu* “six year-old sheep”, *taysu* “he-goat of one year old” (BHeb. tyš “he-goat”), *’anzu* “she-goat of one year-old” (gen. Sem. ’nz ~ ’zz “goat”), but between the ages of four months and one year, a he-goat is called *ḡadyu* (Ug., Heb. gdy “kid”) and a she-goat called *’anāḳu*.

2d) More important to the subject of our investigation is another, perhaps, incomplete and much more complicated system of numerals used in counting things seen as “of the same nature or kind”.

To return to HS word for “two”, there is some evidence pointing to the fact that the CA word is a compound of a stem [θin] “one” plus a dual ending. In comparing masc. *’iθnāni* with masc. *’ibnāni*, we find that both have an initial /’i-/ (Semitic θin- “two”, \*bin- “son”: CA, Akk. binu id.) and a dual suffix \*-āni. Thus *’ibnāni* “two sons”, *raḡulāni* “two men”, *kitābāni* “two books”, and so forth. The accusative form of the number is *’iθnayni*. Again, final -yn is the accusative dual form as in *’ibnayni* “two sons”, *raḡulayni* “two men”, *kitābayni* “two books”, etc. We now turn to examine the feminine form: nom. *’iθnātāni*, acc. *’iθnatayni* = nom. *’ibnatāni*, acc. *’ibnatayni* “two daughters”. The endings /-tāni/ & /-tayni/ consist of -t-, a feminine marker, and -āni (nom.) -ayni (acc.) = a dual marker. Thus, *’ibnatāni/-tayni* “two daughters”; *malikatāni/-tayni* “two queens”, *madrastāni/-tayni* “two schools”, and so forth.

3) The foregoing discussion allows us to establish \*θin- with the signification “one of a kind” plus -āni = dual marker. A similar phenomenon is noted in Eth. *ḳəl’ē(tū)* “two”, formed from the dual of *kull* “each, every (one)” (CA, Sab., Eth. kl id.) plus the dual ending \*-ā(n) as in CA *kilā(na)* “both”, Akk. *kilallā(n)* “both”. Likewise, the word for ‘20’ is expressed by the dual of ‘10’ as in Akk. *’ešrā*, dual of *’ešru* “ten” (CA *’ašru* id.), and that of ‘200’ by the dual of ‘100’ as in CA *mi’atā(ni)*, etc. Thus, the use of the dual of ‘one’ to express “two” (*’iθnāni*) is not an isolated instance in Semitic.

3) It is most likely that the Akk. suffix -ā in *šinā* above has an identical function with that of Akk. *’ešrā* “two *tens*”, i.e. *twenty*. The CA exact cognate is *θinā* as in the PIP of Aws bin Hijr:

«...la’amrī laḳad kānat malāmatahā *θinā*».

In *Hadith*, Prophet Muḥammad said: «*lā θinā fī ’aṣ-ṣadaḳa-ti*», where *lā θinā* means “not two times”, here *θinā* is the dual of once or one, and the meaning of *Hadith* is ‘*Alms*

*must not be taken twice per year*’ (Şāhibi, p. 138; ŞHH VI, 2294): comp. *θinā* with *kitābā*, dual of *kitābu* “book”, *’ibnā*, dual of *’ibnu* “son”, *bintā* dual of *bintu* “daughter”, and so forth.

4) BHeb.-Ug.-Phoen. /-m/, like CA /-āni/, appears only with the word for “two” above. Rationally speaking, if the ending is a determiner or a derivational suffix of any sort, we will certainly see it attached to some, if not all, other lower numerals, like [θlθ] “3”, [šb’] “7”, and [θmn] “8”. Since it is neither a determiner nor a derivational suffix, it is then a kind of suffix different from any suffixed /-m/ discussed so far; it is most likely a dual marker (see §2.17.26 below).

#### Comments

It seems that Semitic terms for ‘thirty, etc. up to ninety’ ending with nom. -ūn ~ -ūm (ū = w), gen.-acc. -īn ~ -īm (ī = y) are made up of the corresponding lower numerals plus pl. marker /-n or -m/ as in CA gen.-acc. *θamānīn* “eighty”, EHeb. *š(mw)nym*, OffAram. *tmnyn*, Pun. *šmnm id.*, etc. It is also possible that the term for ‘twenty’ (CA gen.-acc. *’išrīn*<sup>204</sup>, EHeb. *’šrm*, OffAram. *’šr(y)n*) includes the same pl. form: comp. CA *bin* “son”, gen.-accus. pl. *banīn*.

**2.17.20** Linguistically speaking, CA [ṭwy] is very similar to Semitic \*θny “two” in use and meaning. Comparison of words derived from [ṭwy] and [θny] reveals the following: *ṭawā* = *θanā* “to fold”; *ṭiwā* ~ *ṭuwā* = *θinā*, *θunā* “(anything folded) twice”; *tuwā* = *ma-θniy*, *mu-θannā* “double, dual, twofold”, etc. The *maṣdar* of [ṭwy] is *ṭay* and that of [θny] is perh. *θiny*. *Maṣdar* is a grammatical term designating the origin or source of the word and it is always a noun from which the verb is derived.

The word *ṭiwā* or *ṭuwā* occurs once in the Koran: (إِنَّكَ بِالْوَادِي الْمَقْدِسِ طَوًى) *Verily, You are in the holy valley tiwa/tuwa* (20:12). There is no agreement among scholars on the pronunciation of the word whether it is /ṭiwā/ or /ṭuwā/, nor is there a general agreement on its meaning. Abu Isḥāq reads /ṭuwā/ and interprets it ‘name of a valley’, while others don’t differentiate between *ṭiwā* and *ṭuwā* and interpret it ‘double’, ‘twice’, hence ‘double holy’ (LA r. ṭwy). In ŞHH (VI, 3416) *ṭuwā* ~ *ṭiwā* are variants of the same form, which signifies “double, twice”.

The word *ṭuwā* is a compound of \*ṭuw and the dual ending \*-ā = CA *θin-ā* “twice” = Akk. *’ešr-ā*, dual of *ten*, i.e. *twenty*, etc. see §2.17.19, n. 3 above. Cognates in HS languages are Akk. *ṭawū* “to spin”, Ge. *ṭwy* “to turn”, Har. *ṭewō* “to fold, wrap”, Berb.: Ahaggar *a-ḏə* “be folded”, Tawlemmet *a-ḏu* “to fold, bend” (HSED, n. 2439).

**2.17.21** Notion of ‘two of a kind’ is also expressed in CA by [duw-] and [zuw-] (for *zuw*, §2.17.22 below). It is possible that all such forms are originally variants of a single form. Some illustrative examples are:

1) CA *daudarrā* “with two large or long testicles” (LA; Jamharah III, 1297) is a compound of \**dau-* “two”, \**-daru-* “testicle” (in CA *’udra-tu* fem. id.), and \*-ā from *ى*, i.e. /-y/ “belonging to” (thus ‘of the same kind and having the same function’).

<sup>204</sup> A verb *’ašrana*, said of anything, “make it twenty”.

2) CA *daula-tu* (-tu fem. suffix.) “two armies one defeating another”. Among other derivatives of an etymologically different [dwl] is *duwla-tu* or *dūla-tu*, said of tax or land-tax, lit. “circulating, one time for this group and the other for that group”; CVI *ta-dāwala*, said of anything, lit. “pass from one hand to another”, Akk. *dwl* “go to and fro” (Moscati, 1969: §16.333) = CA *dwl* “(go) from one to another”, hence the fixed expression *dawālayka*, where -(y)ka is not, as one may suppose, “you, your (masc. sg.)”, Cush.: Ga. *duula* “army”, Som. *duulaan* “raiding group” (Zaborski, 1975: 324).

3) Another derivative of CA [dwl] is *dawīlu*, usu. used as adj. post-modifying *kala*’ (grass), “of two years old”, lit. “two years have passed away (since its first appearance)”, i.e. *having been for two years* (LA). The word is of a different origin. For a possible origin of the word, see below.

4) CA *dau-l-* above “two armies, etc.” is a compound consisting of two parts \**dw-* “two” in the sense discussed above and \**-ul-* (\**-’l-*) “army” as in Ug. *ul* “puissance militaire” (DRS I, 12) also “people” (UG, 534), Palm. *’l* “army” (NWSI I, 57). CA *’ālu* “army” as in PIP of A’sha:

«...ḏū *’āl* ḥussāna yuzḡī *’as-samma wa ’as-sala’ā*».

It also occurred with this meaning in the Koran (LA). The word also denotes, like that of Ug., “people” also “family”. As a verb, CA *’āla* “to rule”, BHeb. *’eyāl* “strength, might, force” (OT, 41). To PHS \**-’l-* also belong CA *’illu* “family relationship, family relatives” (= *’ālu* “closest members of family, family”); *’illu* “covenant, agreement, bond” also “ally” = Akk. *ayyalu* “allied”, Palm. *’l* “army-corps”, Syr. *’iyālā* “aid, help”, Phoen., Samal. *’lt* “covenant” (NWSI I, 57, 60-61; DRS I, 17, 20), Assy. *ella-tu* “might, forces” also “family relatives” as in CA above (King, 1898: 320). The proot is also seen in §2.1.14.2, under *Comments* above.

5. CA *dawīlu* (n. 3 above) could be a compound of \**dw-* “two, pair” and \**Wl-*. One possibility is that \**Wl-* is from *walla* “to roll by, pass away” and may denote “two years (having been) rolled by” (you may add to complete the meaning ‘*since its first appearance*’) = “of two years old”. Wrong cognates are Te. *dol* “fois, temps”, SA: Meh. *dəwayl*, Hars. *dewīl*, Šh. *dəwīl* “ancien, vieus”, etc. (DRS IV, 234).

Since the basic meaning of the compound {*dawīlu*} centers around three elements {two + year + past/former/afore}, and since the proposed \**-Wl-* does not denote “year + past”, the possibility has to be utterly dismissed.

The word under discussion is from *ḏawā* “to fade away, wither” (see §2.3.33 above) and [-l] “ago, afore”. This analysis of the word is still incomplete because it has completely overlooked a basic semantic concept in the underlying semantic structure, which is ‘*two*’. However, Bin Faris (ML II, 214) defined *dawīlu*, said of grass or plants, “fading away, becoming dry in the same year”, and so did Jawhari in ṢḤḤ IV, 1700. It appears that Bin Faris and Jawhari’s definition is correct, and the word is orig. a compound of ‘*withering + ago*’. For \**-l-* “ago, before in time”, see §2.17.15 above.

6) One may note that the order of words in *daudarrā*, *daula-* above is not in accordance with the usual patterns of CA. Besides, it is also very strange to find that the compound {*dau + daru*} is used instead of the dual *’udratāni* and {*dau + ’al*} instead of the dual \**’ālāni*. A possible explanation of this phenomenon is that \**dau-* here = “pair”. In accordance with this view, \**-tlu* is bound to be a plural word since “pair” must be

followed by a plural noun in CA and other Semitic languages as in Akk. one *tā-pal zikari* one *tā-pal sinništi*... “one pair of male (horses) and one pair of female (horses)” (AG, 48). What may confirm this view is the fact that -darā in {dau-darā} does not seem to be from the fem. sg. ’udratu, but rather from the pl. ’udaru.

One may argue, however, that \*-darrā itself is a dual form, and that its final /-ā/ is a dual marker, i.e. *the same as that in kitābā dual of kitābu* “book”, etc. To me, final ى = y (i. e. /-ā/) in دودرى = daudarrā is not a dual marker, but rather the same as ى = y in قهقرى *qahqarā* = “moving backward, retreat”, i.e. lit. *moving toward the direction of the qarā*, i.e. *back*, etc. The word also expresses “with a long back” (Jamharah III, 1297) and is from qarqar “back” (LA).

**2.17.22** CA *zaw* “pair, couple” is the antonym of *taw* “single, individual”; *zuwīyyu* “turning away from one thing to another”; CIV ’azwā “to come with someone”; *zawā* “to turn back; make return”, nearly like *ṯanā* in *ṯanā-hu* ‘an id. [r. ṯny “two”]; *zāwīya-tu* “corner”, i.e. *place or space between two things* (walls, etc.) = BHeb. *zwh*, Syr. *zwy* “corner” (OT, 274), OffAram. *zwyh*, JAram. *zwy* id. (NWSI I, 307).

With ġ-ext.: CA *zauġu* “pair, couple” also “husband”; *zauġa-tu* “wife”, but the earliest signification is “one who/that has a mate or one that has another attached to him/her”; *ziwāġu* “marriage, i.e. *involving two*” (taken over from Grk as conjectured by Fränkel, 1962: 106-107). A parallel form is *qirānu* “marriage”; *qarnu* ~ *qarīnu* “one attached to another, hence “a match, mate, associate”; *qarīnu* “husband”; *qarīna-tu* “wife”, lit. *attached to, tied down to*; *qurna-tu* “corner”, Syr. *qrn* id., Pun., *qrny*, Palm. *qrn* “corner” (NWSI II, 1034), etc. This is also the gen. HS term for “horn”. All roots cited so far also express in CA “bring (two) together”. Some other numbers having to do with ‘pair’ and ‘one’ are *zakk-an* “couple, pair”, with *zakā* “even number; pair”, the antonym of *ḥasā* “odd number; one, single, individual”. Among the synonymous terms of *zakkan/zakā* is *ṣafu*, and of *ḥasā* is *witru*. Each of such numbers originally had a very special use.

a) Concerning the term *zauġu*, it was also commonly used, esp. in pre-Islam, to express “type, style, kind (types of colored things)”; *tazwīġu* nowadays expresses “uniting in matrimony (man and woman)”, earlier “classification into types or kinds”, hence ‘man’ belongs to a class or type, ‘woman’ belongs to a different one, and so forth (LA).

b) As for Fränkel’s surmise on CA *zauġu*, for the sake of knowledge, I will deal with ‘borrowing’ in §2.24 below.

It seems to me that there is a very deep relationship between CA *zauġu* above and both *mašaġa* “to mix two (colors, types or kinds of things)” and *mazaġa* “to mix” as in HS languages [msk] ~ [mks] id. If my observation is correct, then /z-/ of *zauġu/mazaġa* and /š/ of *mašaġa* are variants of a sound different from both, perh. *an interdental*: see §2.17.23 below.

**2.17.23** Another number to deal with here is *ḍaudu*. The number is *only feminine* and may refer to a group of she-camels whose number has not been agreed upon. It may be from “3 to 9 or 10”, from “2 to 9”, etc. The term occurred in *Hadith* and denoted,

according to Abu Ubaidah, “one she-camel”, *but he hastened to add that  $\delta$ audu can’t be less than two* (see LA). LA sees that  $\delta$ audu in the old saying: «(‘a) $\delta$   $\delta$ audu ’ilā (‘a) $\delta$   $\delta$ audi ’ibil» stands for ‘two’. Its final \*-d is from the HS feminine ending -t (§2.9 above), becoming /-d/ for seq. const. (it is impossible to say \* $\delta$ autu), and the term \* $\delta$ au- could be the earlier form lying beneath [zau/dau/tau] and may be related to Egyp. dw “five”.

**2.17.24** Among many other numerals that have attracted my attention is *šanaḳu*, having to do in one way or the other with number “5”, and *badd*, whose earlier signification could be something like “in two, two, both” or “alone, each”; CIV ’abadda, said when one gives away anything to people “to give them one by one”. LA [bdd] states: ’ibdādu, (said of a gift) *expresses “to give (people) one by one”*; ta-bādda, said of people, “to pass or move *two by two*”; badadu n. “two thighs far from each other”.

**2.17.25** So far, we have discovered in CA some numerals of a very complicated numeral system as \*θn- “one of a kind” and \*ṭw-/\*dw- “two of a kind”, zaw “two of two different kinds”, etc. This discovery has taken me by surprise because it has never come to my mind that the language (*once I mistakenly thought to have complete mastery over its roots and their derivatives*) has this very complicated system of numerals.

The following study of Semitic [štr ~ šṭr] will concentrate only on the compound noun \*šatru ~ šaṭru, and will have nothing to do with the verbal form, which will only be used as a starting point.

1) Eth. šatara “to cut in two”, BHeb. šṭr “to cut in two” ~ BHeb. štr “to split, burst” (OT, 1020), CA šatara “be torn apart, to cut in two”, šutira “be cut”; šatru “one fourth of *diyya*-tu or *blood-fine*” ~ šaṭara (\*šatara) “to divide, cut in two”; šaṭara, said of a she-camel, “to milk a half of its udder and leave the other half”; šaṭru “half” also “side”, though not of course any ‘side’ or any ‘half’ one may think of.

*What is the special meaning of the term ‘half’ as expressed by CA šaṭru? Is it semantically like all other words for ‘half’ in the language?* The most widely used word for ‘half’ is *niṣfu* (but in modern Arabic dialects the form is usually *nuṣ* or *niṣ* id.) = Ug. nṣp id. (UG, 533). In this case, *what is the difference between šaṭru and niṣfu?* CA *niṣfu* = English half in nearly all respects, whereas CA šaṭru originally has little or nothing to do with “half” as expressed by CA *niṣfu* and English *half*. LA [r. šṭr] states:

*«a she-camel’s udder is divided into two halves: one in the front and the other located behind it, with each half having two teats, and that to milk ‘half’ of a she-camel’s udder (= šaṭara above) is to milk two teats and leave the two others».*

So far, we can see that the word šaṭru = half, i.e. *two of four*. According to Jawhari (ṢḤḤ II, 679), *a she-camel has four teats (أخلاف) and each pair of teats is called šaṭru*.

2) The proverb «*wa ḥalaba fulānun (‘a)d dahra ’aṣṭurahu*» contains the plural form ’aṣṭuru of šaṭru, and said of *one who has experienced different types of life*. The different types are *four in number* or *two halves*, with each half consisting of *two quarters* or *two types of life*: «*the good, evil, welfare and hardship (of life)*», and it developed, according to LA, «*from the analogy of the four teats of a she-camel’s*

udder..., as if one has milked the two teats in front, which are the good, and left the other two, which are the evil». (also see Jamharah I, 725 and ŞHH ibid.). Thus ‘one half’ comprises the good and welfare, and ‘the other half’ the evil and hardship as in the PIP of Laḳiṭ Bin Ma‘mar:

«mā zāla yaḥlubu darra (’a)d dahri ’aṣṭuru-hu» (TŠ, p. 113, L. 6).

3) CA šatru as signifying ‘¼ of the blood-fine’ above implies clearly that a whole blood-fine is divided into or made up of 4 quarters or ¼ x 4, and that each quarter is called ‘šatru’. A natural question may be asked, *why is it that ‘blood-fine’ is divided into four quarters or the sum of four quarters? What are the different circumstances that determine the number of quarters to be paid as blood-fine? Is ‘blood-fine’ paid for destroying or damaging a part of the body of a man or an animal? If this is true, what is that part? Is there any relationship between ‘blood-fine’ and ‘udder’ since each is the sum of four quarters?* Such questions can be clearly answered and lucidly explained only by three forms of speech, of which the first two are dead: Proto-Semitic, Proto-Hamito-Semitic, and Classical Arabic. Let us see what a Semitist says about CA.

3a) It is indisputable that CA is a highly systematic language and presents an exceptional case of conservatism. There is nothing in its structure accidental or without a purpose. Everything is so well arranged and has a definite meaning or function. The CA material discussed thus far perfectly testifies to this fact. *Whether we admit it or not, the obvious fact remains that in dealing with CA phonology and grammar or with roots and their significations, we are in actuality dealing in one way or the other with a form of speech which has remained the closest to Proto-Semitic, the branch of Hamito-Semitic which has also remained, as evidence from CA suggests, the closest to Proto-Hamito-Semitic. In vain will be our analysis and reconstruction of Hamito-Semitic roots and grammar if both are not centered on CA.* Of course, this is not new information about CA, but a type of old and common information known and recognized by all Semitists. Gray (1971: 6), for example, writes:

«From the materials presented by the various Semitic languages enumerated above one may reconstruct, in great part, an hypothetical Proto-Semitic. The principle here followed is that, as observation shows, language tends to become simplified in the course of history, whence Classical Arabic regarded as the most primitive Semitic speech extant».

Similarly, Wright (1966: 27) finds that:

«The Arabs had preserved down to the sixth or seventh century of our era far more of the ancient form and fashion of Semitic speech than any of their congeners».

After comparing CA with all other Semitic languages, De Goeje (quoted by Wright, op.cit: 8), concludes:

«The speech of the Arabs is the nearest approximation that we can have to the primitive Semitic speech».

O’Leary (1966:17) finds Classical Arabic to be “the purest Semitic”, and stresses that «of necessity Classical Arabic must be the starting point for Semitic philology». On the conservatism of Classical Arabic, Bateson (1957: 51) also sees that «Among the Semitic



languages, Arabic is conspicuous as showing the features that characterize Semitic in a very fully realized form», and so forth.

3b) After weighing all possibilities with respect to Semitic \*štr and taking into consideration all types of questions asked above, I have come to the conclusion that the trilateral is a compound of \*šw “four of a kind” and \*tar- “a member (of the body)”. The first part of the compound is preserved intact in CA šawā “quadruped (of an animal, esp. a horse)” (ŠHH VI, 2397) as in the PIP of Durayd Bin Šammah describing his horse:

«salīmi (’a)š šdā ’abli (’a)š šawā šaniġi (’a)n nasā  
 ṭawīli (’a)l qarā nahdin ’asīli (’a)l muḳladi»

PIP Antarah also says:

«wa ḥašiyati sargūn ’alā ’abli (’a)š šawā  
 nahdin marākiluhu nabīlu (’a)l maḥzami».

The Expression «*ḥāliṭa-tu* fem. (“third”) *’aš šawā*» applies to animals only, lit. “third of legs”, i.e. *of three legs* (out of four) = “lame” as in Poet. (Jarīr):

«laḳad walada-t ḡassānu *ḥāliṭa-tu* (’a)š šawā...»

The question that comes to my mind at the end of this section: *Aren’t \*sau- and its synonymous \*kau- id. (pl. kuwā ~ kawā-im) old variants of one single root?*

The second part is in CA *tarra* “to cut with one blow the leg or the hand”. The original meaning was probably “to divide into four (parts), to divide a quadruple entity into two halves, to cut off or destroy one or more elements/members that are seen as components of a quadruplet”. As mentioned above, CA [ṭar] is a variant of [tar]: cf. *tarra-t*, CIV *’atarra-t* ~ *ṭarra-t*, CIV *’aṭarra-t* (-t refers back to the hand), “be cut with one blow”, hence, *turra* “amputated hand” (LA, r. ṭr). The following are brief answers to questions raised above:

3c) *’Blood-fine* is divided into *’four* because an animal has two *fore legs* and two *hind legs*. Each leg is calculated as *’one fourth* of the total *’four*. The relationship between *’blood-fine* and *’udder* centers on two facts: (1) both *are made up of four quarters* and (2) *both apply exclusively to domestic animals*.

From the term *’blood-fine* and its relation to *’fourth*, we can make inferences about a prehistoric *’law*, which is probably as follows: *if one destroys one of the four legs of an animal, he will have to pay a quarter of the blood-fine, if two, will pay two quarters, and so on.*

**2.17.26** Akk. *tu’āmu*, *tā’umu*, CA *tau’amu* “twin”, pl. *tu’āmu*, BHeb. *tō’ām*, Mand. *tauma* (MD, 478), Phoen. *t’m*, Talm. *t’m* (PG, 154), Pun. *twm* “twin” (NWSI II, 1206).

Semitic \*t’m- is not an easy trilateral to analyze. A possible analysis is that the trilateral is based on *taw* “one, single” as in CA *tauw* “single, one individual, one” and Egyp. *tw* “one” (EG, 599).

1) Before making a decision on this trilateral, it may be well to turn to old Arab scholars, as we always do, to see what they have to say about it, for such scholars left no single root or derivative in the language without studying it. The eighth century scholar, Farāhīdi derives *tau’amu* from *waw’amu* and holds that initial *t-* is from an original \**w-*. Similar instances, he cites, is *taulaġu* from *walaġa*, etc. (Al ‘ayn VIII, 424; ŠHH V, p. 1876). This is, in fact, a very common sound change in Semitic languages in general and

CA in particular and can be easily explained in terms of rules (see also §2.11.1 above). Most other Arab scholars followed Farāhīdī. The trilateral [w'm] as in *wa'ama* signifies “to agree with, concord, be in harmony, make alike”; CIII *wā'ama* “conform exactly with, harmonize, bring into harmony, be congruent”; \**waw'amu* > *tau'amu* above (LA, r. w'm). In fact, the sequences *wa'ama*, *wā'ama*, etc. are difficult to pronounce, and for this reason they have never been popular in use. The trilateral used instead is [l'm]: comp. *lā'ama* = *wā'ama* in meaning, also “make peace between, reconcile” = Sab. l'm “make a peaceful settlement” (SD, 81), CA *la'ama*, said of a wound, “to dress a wound”, said of any two things “to make peace between, bring into harmony; weld, fuse, mend”; *mu-lā'ama-tu* “convenience, fitness; concord, harmony”. The only widely used derivative of [w'm] is *wi'āmu* “congruence, agreement”, and the sole reason for its survival is because *li'āmu* has a different meaning, being the plural of *la'īmu* “mean, vile, villain”<sup>205</sup>. For the origin of \**la-* in *la'īmu*, see below.

1a) CA [w'm] is from [ʾm] as in *'amma* “be close to and compatible with, related” (this is perh. SL *yam* “exactly, precisely”), traditionally considered as a derivative of *'ummu* “mother”, Akk. *ummu*, Ug. *'um*, EHebr., Phoen., Pun., OffAram., Hatra, Palm., Nab. *'m* id., Ge. *'əm* id. Also belong here Akk. *ummān* “people, army”, CA *'umma-tu(n)*, fem., “nation, tribe”, pl. *'umamu*, Ug. *'umt* “family”, BAram. *'ummat* “people, nation, race”, Syr. *'umtā* “nation”, etc.

2) An affix \**l-* of two different origins is prefixed twice to Semitic \**'m*, creating two new trilaterals.

2a) One of such *l*'s is the negative \**l-* (see §2.21.2 below): CA *'umma-tu* “good, benevolent, charitable (person)” > {*l* “not” + *'m*} *la'īmu* “mean, vile villain, scoundrel” as a noun *lu'mu*.

2b) Another \**l-* is prefixed to [ʾum] “people, nation”, etc. above, as in Ug. *lim* “people” (UG, 534), BHeb. *lə'ōm* “people, nation” (OT, 507), OffAram. l'm “people, nation” (NWSI I, 561), CA preserved this word in *li'mu arch.* “a match; exactly like” and in such *arch.* derivatives as *la'mu* “tough, strong” and *la'ma-tu* “weapon”.

3) With the discovery that Can. *šnym* “two” contains a dual \*/-m/ ending (cf. §2.17.19, n. 4 above), one may assume that the word is a compound of \**taw* “one” plus \**-m*. Frankly speaking, the real reason for this assumption, one may wonder, has indeed nothing to do with the discovery that Can. has preserved a reflex of an old dual ending. Bin Faris (ML I, 362) said: we say *taw'amu* “twin” and also *taw'amāni* “twin” as in *humā* (they both, dual) *taw'amāni*. We expect the latter form to signify something like “double twin”, since it contains the dual ending in /-āni/, but it does not (comp. *kitābu* “book” > *kitābāni* “two books”, etc.). What may weaken the view, however, is that Farāhīdī (Al 'Ayn I, 424) had much earlier proscribed this form and prescribed *taw'mu*.

The Canaanite dual ending \**-m* is seen in some other words as in Ug. *aḥdm* “pair” (UG, 534): *aḥd* “one” (§2.12.18 above) and also in §2.3.31, ft<sup>3</sup>.

#### Comments

The analysis of [t'm] as ‘*dual of one*’ is one possibility. Another theoretical analysis is

<sup>205</sup> The original meaning of *li'āmu* has been preserved in a proverb: «*laulā* ('a)l *li'āmu lahalika* ('a)l *'anāmu*». However, the word *wi'āmu* is often used in the proverb instead of *li'āmu*.

that \*tw = “two of a kind” plus \*-m- “similarity, likeness; alike”. The problem with the 2<sup>nd</sup> choice, attractive though it is, can hardly be accepted since [taw] expresses “one” and not “two”. A way out of this dilemma is to trace /t-/ of [t'm] to an earlier /θ-/ and assume that [θ-] was split into /t-/ and /θ-/ and that both have, like nearly everything else, been preserved in CA: [θa'] “two of a kind” (§2.17.19 above), while [taw] “one, single, individual”.

**2.17.27** CA šimālu “the left hand, left, north”, said of birds or of anything coming from the north (i.e. *left-hand*) “of ill or bad omen”; šumlā “the left hand” as opposed to yumnā “the right hand”. According to Ašma'i «šimālu = šu'mu», i.e. *bad-luck, evil omen* (LA, r. šml), and to Bin Faris (ML III, 239), [š'm] signifies “the left side” as in maš'am-tu “the left side” and is the opposite of maymana-tu “the right side”. The form šu'm- seems to underlie the trilateral [šml], and its stem vowel finds its match in Akk. šumēlu “the left hand, left side” (AG, 106). The absence of compensatory lengthening of /-u-/ upon the loss of following /'/ in Akk. may be due to the presence of another long vowel /ē/ in the next syllable. In accordance with this analysis, Akk. \*-ēlu and CA \*-ālu = BHeb. \*-l in [šm'l] “the left hand, left, north”, and Ug. \*'l- in [šm'l] “left, north” (Shehadeh, 1968: 75; OT, 1012). So far, the word appears to be a compound, whose second part is \*'l- “to, toward” (as in CA 'l, etc. gen. Semitic id.). This part as well as the original trilateral is also seen in Sab. -l in [š'ml] “be northward”, from š'm “north” (SD, 130).

As we may expect, the different words found in BHeb., Ug., and Sab. for “north” are also seen in CA, esp. in *the Koran and PIP*. The BHeb. word above = Koranic šamā'ila “left” as in (عن اليمين والشمائل) *to the right and to the left* (16:48), and Sab. š'ml = CA šym (š'm'l) “north” as in the PIP of Imri' Al Qays:

«...šayūdin mina 'al-'iḳbāni ṭa'ṭa'tu šīmālī» (LA *ibid.*).

The same word in the line of poetry is also pronounced as *šimlālī* or *šimlāli* (in LA r. df).

As for Sab. š'm above, it is cognate with CA [š'm] in ša'āma-tu or ma-š'ama-tu (tu = fem. suffix) “to the left, northward”. Presumably, final /-m/ in Semitic [š'm] and prefixed /m-/ in CA m-š'm (ma-š'ama-tu) go back to the same PHS bound morpheme. This implies that [š'm] is a compound of \*š'- “north” + -m- “toward, to, to the direction of”, but the order of this prepositional phrase violates the common Semitic word order which places the prep. before its object. It can only be acceptable if \*-m is an adverbial ending, i.e. \*-m = CA -an as in šarḫ-an “eastward”, šimāl-an “northward”, etc.

a) šu' + m- “to(ward) the north, northward”. An ultimate connection between this /-m/ and CA adverbial /-n/ should not be dismissed: cf. CA šimālu “north” > šimālan “to the north, northward”, šarḫu “east” > šarḫan “to the east, eastward” as in *ḍahaba šarḫan* “he went eastward” = *ḍahaba 'ilā 'aš šarḫ* or *li š šarḫ*, (/aš/, with its reduced form /š-/), is a phonologically conditioned allomorph of /'al/ “the”), etc. One may note that /-an/ = /'ila/ & its reduced form /li/. The final /-an/ is used to form adverbs from nouns as *kaṭ'an* “definitely” (kaṭ'u n. “cut”), *fawran* “urgently”, *ḥālan* “immediately”, *ra'san* “directly” (ra'su n. “head”), *šidḫan* “truly” (šidḫu “truth”), *yawman* “by day” (yawmu “day”) = Akk. *ūmam* “by day” (ūmu “day”), Heb. *yōmām* id., *'omnām* “truly”, etc. (Moscatti,

op.cit: §12.73).

The original function of final [-n /-m] here seems to be *a case ending*. Thus one may have the choice to use *this ending* or *a preposition* before the noun, hence CA *fawran* above or *ʿalā* (= on) *l* (= the) *fawr* “urgently”, *ḥālan* above or *fī* (= in) (*ʿa*)*l ḥāl* “immediately”, *rāḡilan* “on foot” (= Sab. *rglm* id.: *rgl* “foot” cf. SD, 116) or *ʿalā r riḡl*-id. (/r/ is from *ʿal* “the), etc. The last cited prepositional phrase has given rise to a quadrilateral [*ʿrḡl*] in CA: *ʿarḡala* “come on foot”, where *ʿalā* has been reduced to /ʿa/, *r* (from *ʿal*) dropped. As a matter of fact, in most modern dialects *ʿalā* is /ʿa/.

**2.17.28** OffAram., JAram. *ḥwb* “obligation, debt” (NWSI I, 352), BHeb. *ḥūb* “be or become under penalty”; *ḥōb* “bebt”, Syr. *ḥwb* “guilt, debt” (OT, 98), Sab. *ḥwb* “sin” (SD, 73), CA *ḥawba-tu* “care and sorrow; in great need, in debt”; *ḥawbu*, said of man, “weak, needy, guilty, sinful” as a vb *ḥāba*; *taḥawwubu* “complaint, sorrow, and pain” as a vb *taḥawwaba*, etc. are most likely cognate with Egyp. *ḥb* “grief, misery”; *ḥb-t* “lamentation, grief” as a vb *ḥb*. The verb is from a phrase *ḥw yb* “lamentation, sorrowful man”. The Egyp.-Sem. words are from a compound of [*ḥaw*] “lack, be in want”, as in Egyp. *ḥw* id., and [*yb*] “heart” as in Egyp. *yb* id. (EHD I, 469, 37). The gen. Semitic term for “heart” is [*lub*], which- I believe- a genuine cognate of Egyp. [*yb*].

1) Another trilateral including [*yb*] “heart” is CA *mi-ḥrāb* “sanctuary place” (Koran 3: 39) also “*a raised recess in the middle of the wall fronting you as you enter into a mosque*”, arch. “palace”. Azhari asserts that *miḥrāb* is so-called because *Imām*<sup>206</sup> of the mosque is alone in it (LA). The idea “*seclude oneself in a place away from people*, i.e. *be alone*”, is considered to be one of the basic notions lying beneath the term, and it can be expressed by [*ḥr*] as in *ta-ḥrīru a child* = lit. “*make him devote himself wholly to God*”. The utterance used for explaining the meaning of the expression in CA is *the child yu-fradu* = (put) *alone* (LA). I have chosen ‘*set aside or devote*’ instead of ‘(put) *alone*’ for the sake of clarity. Sab. *ḥrb* “place of obtaining oracle” also “feature of a building, palace, etc.” (SD, 69-70), etc.

a) Semitic [*ḥrb*] is etymologically identical with Egyp. phrase *ḥrī yb-t* “sanctuary place, the middle room of a palace”: *ḥrī*, *ḥr* “middle” and *yb* “heart” (EHD, I, 494, 37; also see EG, §165 and p. 582).

b) CA *ḥur* can signify “middle” as in the PIP of Ṭarfah:

«...ʿalā rubba yawmin lī siwā *ḥurr* dāriki» (LA): *ḥurr* “middle of”, *dāriki* fem. “your house”.

c) Egyp. *ḥr* “face, sight” as in *m ḥr-f* “in his sight” (EG, 582) = *ḥurru* (ʿal *waḡhi*) “the forward part (of the face)”; *ḥurra-tu* fem. “cheek”.

d) Egyp. *ḥrī* “chief, master, superior” (EHD I, 494) = CA *ḥurru* “the foremost man, noble man, master, free man”, BHeb. *ḥr*, *ḥwr* “noble, free-born”, BAram., Syr. *ḥr* “make free” (= CA *ḥarrara* id.), OffAram., Nab. *ḥr* “person of note, noble” (NWSI I, 402; OT, 349).

e) All above-mentioned words are based on a stem [*ḥar*], which is etymologically quite different from [*ḥar*] “heat, hot; to burn” (§2.2.32, n. b above).

<sup>206</sup> One who leads the prayer.

**2.17.29** Ug. ḥṭ-t “wheat” (UG, 533), EHeb. ḥṭ-m pl., OffAram. ḥnṭ’, JAram. ḥnṭ-yn pl., Samal ḥṭh, Palm. ḥṭ’ id. (NWSI I, 363), Akk. uṭṭutu “grain, barley”, Soq. ḥinteh id., Chad.: Hadiya hiṭe, Kambatta hiṭe “grass” (HSED, n. 1272), CA ḥinṭa-tu coll. fem. “grain, wheat”. All are from a compound of [ḥiW-] and [ṭa’]; the 1<sup>st</sup> element is seen in Egyp. ḥy-t “grain”, ḥī “wheat, grain”, etc., the 2<sup>nd</sup> in Egyp. t’ “earth, land”, and the whole trilateral is orig. a phrase of two words as in Egyp. ḥn t’ “grain” (EHD I, 488). It is possible that /-n-/ is a *gen. marker*, and it is one of a number of particles (-y, ’l, etc.) performing this function. I have already drawn attention to this marker. It is also possible that /-n-/ is a *prep. signifying* ‘(coming) *from*’.

CA has many easily recognized roots including proot [ṭa-], one of which is maṭaṭa “touch s.t. on the ground (earth) with the hand”: maṭṭa “touch with the hand” + [ṭ-] “earth”.

**2.17.30** There is no doubt that CA and all other sister languages had once an autonomous proot \*-’- denoting “hand/arm”. The proot is still seen in many trilaterals, esp. *those denoting* (part of) *hand/arm* as in PSem. [ḏr’] (see §2.6, n. 5 above), [bw’] as in CA bā’u: baw’u “length of the two outstretched arms” = Eth.: Ge. bā’, Te. bā’ “span of the arms”, SA: Šh. bi’, Soq. bāḥ, Meh. bôt “span of the arms”; Šh. be’, Soq. bāḥ “to measure” (DRS II, 52), šb’ (see §2.1.10, n. 8 above), [kw’] as in kū’ “elbow”, ḏb’ (see §2.13.24, *Comments* II above), etc.<sup>207</sup>

1) Egyp. evidence, namely in the compound preposition m-’ lit. “in the hand of”, has a central role in shedding light on the origin of CA ma’ “with” as in ma’ī “I have”, i.e. ‘with me’ (in my hand) = Egyp. m-’-ī “in my hand” (EG., 132, n. 2), CA ma’ak “you have, you possess, i.e. with thee” = Egyp. m-’-k “with thee” (EG, 132, n. 1), CA ma’anā “We have, i.e. with us”; ma’an “together”. In other Semitic languages the compound appears as ’m as in Ug., EHeb., OffAram., JAram., Sab., etc.

It is important to note that a combination of *prep.* + *pers. pron.* to create a verb form is common in CA, e.g. ’indi “I have”, lit. “at me”: ’ind “at, in”, ’alay-ya “I must”, lit. *on me*, ’alay-ka “you must”, etc.: ’alā “on”, etc.

1a) Among compound trilaterals containing the proot \*-’- “hand, arm”, I may cite CA ṣafa’a “to slap with the palm of the hand”. Farāḥīdī defines it as “to strike the back with hand” (Al ’Ayn I, 308) ~ safa’a “to slap the face with the open hand” as in safa’-tu (I strike) waḡ-ha (face of) fulānin (someone) bi-yad-ī (with my hand) (Al ’Ayn I, 341), Ge., Te. šāf’a “to slap”, Tna. šāf’e, Amh. ṭāffa, ṭāfāṭṭ, A., E., M., Ms., Go. ṭāff-m, Har. ṭāfit “slap”, En. tāfa (HED, 152). All are ultimately from a compound of \*sap- “strike, smite, hit” + \*-’-. The root \*sp is seen in Egyp. sp = “to fight” (EHD II, 661) and SL as in saffai-tu bi-l-kaf, i.e. “I slapped him with the palm of the hand”. In MSA and all dialects ṣafa’-tu expresses an identical meaning.

The foregoing discussion shows clearly that SL [saf] as it stands = “to strike”, and that if we want to express “strike with the palm of the hand” we simply add {bi-l-kaf}.

<sup>207</sup> Among other examples are [wk’] and [kt’] where the former expresses “a kind of deflection in the thumb of the hand or foot” as in waka’u (Al ’Ayn II, 182) and the latter expresses (’akta’u) “a kind of deflection in the hand”.

Now, the same sentence, as has been mentioned above, can equally be expressed by suffixing \*-' to \*šaf. This phenomenon explicitly tells that \*-' = *hand* or *kaf*. For the interchange of /s/ and /š/, see §2.2.48 above.

**2.17.31** Sab. lfy “to meet, find s.o., to get s.t.” (SD, 82), CA CIV ’alfā of [r. lfy] “to meet, find”: \*fy- in CA wāfā s.o. “to come to meet”; CX ’istaufā “to get back s.t.”, etc. see §2.12.15 above. A near antonym of CA ’alfā s. t. seems to be CVI talāfā s. t. “to avoid meeting or encountering”, but it is an antonym of wāfā as in wāfā-hu “to come to meet him”, but talāfā-hu “to avoid (meeting) him”.

**2.17.32** CA lamasa “to touch with the hand”. Evidence shows clearly that the triliteral [lms] is plainly a compound consisting of two parts: \*l- + \*-ms-. The second element of the compound is from PHS stem \*maš- “to touch” as in CA massa “to touch”, Sab. mss id. (SD, 87), BHeb. māšaš id.; mašāš “massage”, Tna. masāsā “to rub”; masāwā “caress, massage”, Har. māša “to rub, wipe”, En., Gt. mašā(m) “wipe off”, E., M. maššā(m), Ed. maššā “to rub”, Amh. massāsā “rub” (HED, 113). The stem \*maš-, seen in §2.12.34 above, is definitely from [maθ].

1) Some other derivatives are CA masīsu “sexual intercourse”; massu “insane”, from “touch” = Eyp. ms “a kind of disease”.

2) The /l-/ can occur in medial position as in CA mallasa (from \*massasa, by dissim.) “to touch or rub gently with the hand”, hence [mls] “smooth”, mlāθu “to play with (man and woman), courtship” = Sab. mlθ “have sexual intercourse with a woman” (SD, 86).

2) It is to this stem belongs CA ṭamaṭa “have sexual intercourse with”, i.e. ‘touch’ as in the Koran: (لم يطمئن إنس من قبل ولا جان), where *yaṭmiṭhunna* = *yamsashunna* [mss] “touch” (Al ’Ayn VII, 412): ṭ- is from caus. d-.

3) The deep meaning of CA \*maš- (mas-) is “to touch with the hand”, this is also the deep meaning of \*maθ- as in CA maṭṭa “to touch with the hand” = massa ~ mašša id., hence Imri’ Al Qais’ verse of poetry (in §2.12.34 above) is also cited as «*namuṭṭu...*» (instead of «*namuššu...*»)<sup>208</sup>

4) We may conclude that all HS words cited above, including CA [ms] and its cognates in Semitic (see §2.12.34), are derived from [maθ]. This fact explicitly tells that numerous roots with /s/ or /š/ and even /š/ in Semitic are from roots with earlier /θ/. In many cases, however, CA has fortunately preserved both roots, together with their underlying form. This salient characteristic of CA has already been drawn attention to in §2.2.51, under *Comments II* above and, because of its great importance, it may be well here to give some illustrations.

5) For example, Sab. θ’y “slander, calumny” (SD, 149) = CA s’y id.: *sa’ā bihi* = *wašā*<sup>209</sup> *bihi* = *waṭā bihi* (*bihi* is from *bi* “in, at”, *hi* “him”) “make a malicious calumny,

<sup>208</sup> As in some other Semitic languages (e.g. Akk., Heb., etc.), PSem. \*θ becomes /š/ in CA, but only in some of its occurrences. In nearly all cases, however, CA preserved both forms, one with /θ/ and the other with /š/ as in ṭalaṭa ~ šalaṭa “to crack, scratch; split” (Al ’Ayn VI, 359), nabaṭa ~ nabaša “to extract, draw out”, etc.

<sup>209</sup> SA: Meh. awōši, Jib. ōši “causer du trouble, mettre quelqu’un au courant de quelque chose, divulguer”, Har. waša “raconter des histoires sur quelqu’un” (DRS VII, 642).

to injure someone”. All are, by metathesis, from a word \*aθ-, preserved intact in CA \*aθā “make a malicious calumny, injure” (SHH VI, 2264), thus = sa\*ā, wašā, waθā, perh. = Egyp. yθ “to hurt” (EHD I, 100).

5a) If I want to elaborate on the developments of this proot in CA and other Semitic languages, I should add that [\*aθ] had first developed a voiced variant in Proto-Sem. \*’aδ-, but later the variant has become an autonomous triliteral [\*δy] as in CA \*āδā “to hurt, harm, injure” (also [wδy] “injure, wound”), Lih. ’δy “provoquer le désordre”, Eth. Te. ’adā “faire mal” (DRS I, 10). In BHeb. we find [\*sy] instead of the expected \*’zy which has been preserved in יִזְכֹּךְ “hurt, harm, mischief” (OT, 73).

5b) One may object to the connection of CA sa\*ā ~ θa\*ā with wašā ~ waθā, etc. above on the basis that their phonological differences are difficult to reconcile, and that a semantic criterion alone, as we know well, is never sufficient for establishing cognates or derivatives. To solve the problem in a way that meets the demands of reason and scientific investigation, the first step is to recognize the fact that sa\*ā is etymologically different from its homophonous sa\*ā “to endeavor, seek” and from sa\*ā “get lost, perish”. This fact may suggest that sa\*ā is a variant of older θa\*ā. The next step will be a scientific explanation of the presence of /-’-/ in θa\*ā and its absence from waθā, taking into account the nature of the language we are dealing with. In admitting the fact the /’/ is never dropped in any derivative in CA, we are, as a matter of fact, trying to narrow down the problem by limiting it to an account of the absence of the voiced pharyngeal from waθā.

The only consonants that can be frequently dropped or interchange position with one another in the language are /’, w, y/. In accordance with this fact, if θa\*ā and waθā are ultimately from the same proot, then the /-’-/ of θa\*ā must have been from an original /-’-/ and this may explain its retention in one derivative and loss in another. In fact, CA has preserved the earlier [θ’] as in θa\*ā “to vitiate, corrupt, ruin” also “injure, harm”; θa’yū “wounds, killing, and the like”. Moreover, shifting the radicals of θa\*ā will give rise to two trilaterals [\*θy] in CA \*aθiya “to corrupt, vitiate” and [\*yθ] in CA \*āθa “hasten to corrupt, vitiate” (Al ‘Ayn II, 231). A third triliteral [\*θ] derived from this notion is seen in CA \*uθθa-tu fem. “a moth”, Moab. \*š id. (NWSI II, 890), BHeb. \*āšē “to fall in, to fall away, e.g. of garments falling in pieces from use or from being moth-eaten, etc.”: BHeb. \*āš “a moth” (OT, 825, 826), Akk. ašāšu “moth”, Chad.: Mandara, Glavda cācā “louse”, Zeghwana cīcī id., Kera ačuči “ant” (HSED, n. 1034).

**2.17.33** Egyp. šhb “the hot south wind”; šhbī “the god of the south wind” (EHD II, 750) ~ š’h’b id. (EHD II, 727), šhb also expresses “be hot, burned up, parched” (EHD II, 750), CA šahbā’u “the cold north wind”; šahbā’u, said of the earth, “barren, drought” as in the PIP of Zuhair Bin Abi Salma:

«’iā (’a)s sanat (’a)š šahbā’u bi (’a)n nāsi ’ağḥafat...».

CA šihbu “luminous meteor” also “torch, glistening flame” as in the Koran (37:10): (ثاقب فأتبعه بشهاب). The term also denotes “shooting or falling star” as in the PIP of Labid:

«wa mā (’a)l mar’u ’illa ka (’a)š šihābi wa ḏau’ihi

yaḥūru ramādan ba'da 'iḏ huwa sāṭi'u» (DL, p. 88, L. 6).

All are from a compound of stem \*šaw- “hot” in Egyp. šww or š'w “hot, dry, parched”, š' “be hot”, šw “light, sun” (EHD II, 724, 732), Akk. šāu “to roast”, CA šawā id., Berb. zwu “to dry”, etc. (VPHS, 137, n. 278), Chad.: Dera see, Ngam sa “become dry”, Bol., Krk. saa id., Mobu səwu “dry up” (HSED, n., 2224) and stem [hab] as in Egyp. hb- “wind” (EHD II, 445) = CA habba “to blow (wind), etc. The Egyp-CA compound word was formed long after the full establishment of \*hab-

It is indeed amazing that SL šahab also denotes, said of an oil lamp, “to give an intense light before it dies out”, i.e. *it is last light*. Is [ša] a proot signifying “last”? I have another word including this proot: šaha' (< šahaḡa) wa (and) māt (die), where šaha' “last breathing in”.

### Comments

There is still another trilateral with initial /š/ expressing a similar meaning as in BHeb. šāhab “to shine, glitter, as gold”, Talm. šhb id. (OT, 885), CA 'a-šhab “reddish (as of hair)”; šayhab “very hot”, etc. These are from a compound of proot \*šw- and a stem \*hab. The proot is seen in BHeb. שָׁ “dryness; dry place, desert” (OT, 891)<sup>210</sup>, OAram. šyh “drought” (NWSI II, 966), CA šawā “be dry, parched”; mu-šwā-tu ~ mu-šrā-tu fem. (note the interchange of /w/ and /r/) “dry”; šāwī, said of palm-trees, “dry and thirsty”. It is also seen in large numbers of trilaterals: in combination with \*-hal as in Ug. šhl “to glow” (UG, 533), BHeb. šāhal “to shine, be bright” (OT, 885), in combination with \*had as in CA šayhad “very hot”; šahada “to scorch”; šahīdu “scorching heat”, in combination with \*har as in šahara “to smelt”; šahru “hot” also “roasted (meat)”. For many other trilaterals based on this proot, see §2.13.24 above.

**2.17.34** Akk. šabābu ~ šapāpu “scintiller”, Aram. šbībā “flamme”, šwb “brûler”, Soq. šbb “be warm”, HEgyp sb' “étoile” (VPHS, 133, n. 259), CA šabba “to flame up a fire, burn” as in the PIP of Labīd:

«...ka-duḥāni muš'alatin yušabbu dirāmuhā» (p. 170, L. 1).

BHeb. šābtb “flame”, BAram. šəbtb, Syr. šbb “to inflame” (OT, 1029).

a) The words cited above seem to be from PHS \*šw + \*-b-. The compound is seen in Egyp. š'wbu “flame, fire” (EHD II, 725), Aram. šwb above as well as in SL (also in other dialects) šawb “hot”. The first element of the compound is seen in a number of CA trilaterals with different extensions as in šuwādu “flame without smoke” (in SL “intense heat”), CA, NWS šwt “be burned” (NWSI II, 1116), etc, Egyp. š'w “be hot, burn, fire” (EHD II, 724). For the second element, see below.

b) The trilateral [šbb] also expresses “to rise” as in CA šabba, said of a horse, “to jump, lift up the hands”, i.e. *to rise*, said of a male animal, “have sexual intercourse”, and here the idea of ‘rise’ is evident, said of a human being “to grow”, hence šābbu “young man”; šabābu “youth, early life”, said of the day, “early part of the day”, i.e. *just rising*; šabbu “rising of anything”.

c) Stem [hab] also expresses “to rise” in Hamito-Semitic as the following examples

<sup>210</sup> It is the same root in EHeb. yšt “to burn” (NWSI I, 466).



may suggest (starting with CA):

- (a) said of a star, “to rise”,
- (b) said of a sleeping person, “to wake up”, i.e. to rise = Tham. hb “wake up”, Syr. habb “éclater, se manifester”,
- (c) also “to jump, be agitated, rise” = Berb.: Tawareq hubbet “saisir et enlever rapidement”, Kab. hubb “bondir”, Cush.: Saho habbā “bond”,
- (e) said of a male animal (camel, goat, etc.) “have sexual intercourse” = Tna. habābā “pousser un cri d’affolement (bouc en rut), Te. habbā “bêler fort (chèvre avant la copulation), hæb belā “sauter sur une jambe”,
- (f) said of the wind, “to blow”, whose implicit meaning is that the wind is abated and then it suddenly rises = Ge. hababa, “soufler (vent)”, Tna. habābā, Te. habbā “rugir (vent)”, Har. ḥabāb bāya “to blow (wind)”, Cush.: Bil. habba “wind”, Berb.: Tawareq hubbet “to blow”, Egyp. heb “south wind” (EHD I, 445) (= CA habūbu, according to Azhari, “(a kind of) wind that blows up the dust”), Akk. šubtu “wind”, Soq. šiboh id., Chad.: Kera ke-seba id. (HSED, n. 2333).
- (h) habhabiy “good singer” = SA: Jib. ehbeb “chanter”, etc.<sup>211</sup>

**2.17.35** Akk. la’bu “flame”, CA lahabu id., pl. *’alsina-tu* (fem. ‘tongues’) *’al lahabi* lit. “tongues of fire”, BHeb. lahab id., Eth. lāhb “flame” (Gray, 1971: 15), Te. läblib, läbba id. Har. läblāb id., Tna., Amh. nābālbā id., Cush.: Kam. labani “flame”, Ga. belbelu id. (HED, 98), Egyp. rhbw “flame”; rhb-t “flames”, Copt. (e)lhōb id. (EHD I, 429). With prefixed caus. š-: BHeb. שִׁלְהַב [šlhb], with caus. \*š- becoming a part of the root, “to flame up” corresponds to CA CIV *’lhb* caus. of [lhb] “to flame up”. The trilateral is a compound of \*l- and stem [hab]. The meaning of \*l- is most likely “tongue”. though see §2.12.33 above.

**2.17.36** Heb., Talm. hībḥēb, Aram.: Targ. habhēb “flamber, griller”; habhabā “chaleur ardente”, Te. habhab belā “flamber” (DRS V, 356). In CA habba-t, said of a fire, “to flame up, break out”. All are from a compound of stem \*haW- + \*-b-. The first element is seen in Egyp. h’ “to burn, break into flame; heat, fire” (EHD I, 439). The second element of the compound is from \*-b- “rising”, as shown above.

a) To this compound also belong CA hawb-, SA: Meh., Hars. hwōb “réchauffer”, Meh. hīwāb, Hars. šhāwōb, Jib. šāhēb “se réchauffer”, Jib. hub, Eth.: Te. hāb “ardeur de feu, chaleur”, etc. (DRS V, 383).

**2.17.37** Amh., Arg., Har. amna “last year”, Gaf. yaymān, M. emna, etc. id. (HED, 26). The Ethiopic word is a compound comprising a word \*’ām- “year” and \*-na. The first element is seen in CA ’āmu “year”, Sab. ’wm id. (SD, 23), Ge., Tna., Har., Amh., M., Go. ’amāt id. (HED, 27). Concerning \*-na, it is also seen with the same sort of meaning in the following words:

a) Har. sēstina “before yesterday”, M., Ms., Go. sāstāna id., E., En., Gt. sāstāra, A. sistāna, A. sistāna, etc. id. (HED, 143).

---

<sup>211</sup> For the Hamito-Semitic words, see Cohen, DRS V, 355-356.

b) Har. ra'tina “the day before before yesterday”, lit. *fourth day ago*, M., A. aräbättəna “the fourth day ago”, S. ra'abtəna id. (HED, 132).

c) Har. tāḫəna “yesterday, the day before”, S. tāḫəna, W. tāḫənä id., wrongly connected by Cerulli with Ge. təmaləm id., etc. (see §2.17.15 above); Leslau (HED, 148) doubts the connection and expresses the following incomprehensible view on the suffix:

«the element -na expresses the distance or an anterior state as in Amh. amna “last year”, that is, -na (anterior) to am “year”. On this basis one would be tempted to interpret taš = tač = taš as meaning either “two”, for which, however, there is no correspondence in the language, or “under, below” (Amh. tač id.), that is “anterior to below”».

To express “last year” or lit. “year last/before”, we need two terms: one for “year” and another for “last, before in time & the like”. The presence of ‘ām “year” may give a hint that the 2<sup>nd</sup> element could possibly be a term for “last”.

I have seen an /-n/ having to do with ‘before in time’ in very few CA words. One of such words is ‘awān “one before in time, afore, ago” and is usu. used in PIP with ḥarb “war” to signify that “the war was fought *once before*”, i.e. *the war was not the first since it had been preceded by another* (LA). My view on this word is that it is a compound of [‘w] “one” (§2.17.15 above) and \*-’an, \*-n “before in time”<sup>212</sup>. There is, however, no strong evidence supporting such a compound and the meanings assigned to its parts. It is possible, however, that CA /-n/ is ultimately from ‘annā “make late, late after the proper time” (e.g. *make the train arrive late*) as in Poet. of Huṭai’ah:

«wa ‘anai-tu (‘a)l ‘ašā’a ‘ilā suhailin  
‘aw (‘a)š šī’riy faṭāla biya (‘a)l ‘inā’u».

Another example includes the [-n] in question is pl. ma-γānī, sg. ma-γnā “a house that *was once inhabited*”, i.e. *its inhabitants deserted it*; γanā arch. *most strangely expresses “was”*. No present tense.

**2.17.38** BHeb. šāpad “to adhere firmly, to cleave fast”, Lam 4,8 (OT, 901), Syr. špd “fetter”, Mand. spt̄ ~ spt̄ “to fasten” (MD, 396), CA šafada “to fetter”, esp. *the ankles*. In *Hadith*, however, «نهى عن صلاة الصافد», *šāfid prayer is forbidden*: šāfid = (one standing for prayer) with feet very close to each other as if they were fettered; šafdu “fetter, shackle”; mušaffadu “fettered” (cf. Koran: 14: 49).

1) What is the origin of [šfd]? The foregoing discussion may suggest that the word consists of \*š- and \*fad-, \*fād- “foot”. However, joining \*š- and \*-fad- together gives rise to a combination which is grammatically correct, but semantically *nonsense*. Thus, it is rejected.

1a) A blend of [šaf-] (see §2.17.17 above) and [fad-] is also rejected on the basis that it is illogical to derive “fetter” from “put one’s feet in order”. Here, one should not be

<sup>212</sup> The word also signifies “one in her middle age” as in the Koran: «lā fāridūn wa lā bikrun ‘awānu» (2: 68), *it is* (referring to a cow) *neither too old nor too young, but of middling age*. A better understanding of this verse calls for dividing ‘age’ into two halves: *one elapsed and another still in existence*. The emphasis here centers on ‘one whose first half of age has elapsed’.

led astray by [špt ~ šbt, etc.], which signifies “set in order” as in Mand. špt “to join, put in order, connect” also “to adorn, beautify”, JAram., NHeb. špt (MD, 396), SL šaffat “put in order” from šaff “to put in a row, set in order”, while [šbt] is in OAkk. “to seize” (Gelb 1961: 176), BHeb. \*šbt “grasp with the hand”, hence šepet only in pl. šəpātīm “handfuls”, in Talm. id. (OT, 882) ~ BHeb. šābat, CA ḏabaṭa “to grasp with the hand” (SL also expresses “to beautify, put in order, decorate (house, etc.)” = Egyp. ḏb “to decorate”: cf. EHD II, 904, Palm. šbt “to decorate”, etc.: cf. NWSI II, 958. Besides, CA ḏabaṭa “to grasp with the palm of the hand”, etc., Assy. šabātu “to grasp, hold fast, capture” (King, 1898: 378), OAram. šbyt “holder” (AG, 13), etc. All are from [ḏab] in CA ḏabba “to grasp with the hand, or palm of the hand, to seize”, and is ultimately from \*ḏub- “finger” (see §2.1.10, n. 7 above). This very ancient proot appears in the entire Semitic languages as [šbʿ], but in Egyp. [ḏbʿ], and is certainly a compound of \*ḏub- “finger” and \*-ʿ- “hand” as has been shown in (see §2.1.10, n. 7 above). It is this stem [ḏub] that underlies CA ḏabba ~ ḏaffa “to milk with the whole palm of the hand” (ML III, 358).

1b) Returning to [šfd], any other possibility that does not include a term for “tie, bind, and the like” will equally face the same fate of rejection.

I strongly believe that [šfd] is a compound of \*šW- “tie, join together” (§2.12.1 above) and \*fad- “foot” (§§2.3.44 & 2.12.30 above).

**2.17.39** CA *naubu* denotes “bees”, even though it may have nothing to do with ‘bees’, as old Arab scholars assumed. Our ancestors observed the marvelous phenomenon that *a bee* can find its way back to its hive after traveling long distances- tens of miles- in search for flowers. Only for this reason, they are called *naubu* (LA). It is most likely that the term had been in use long before its extension (perh. as a nickname) to ‘bee’. The basic lexical meaning of [nwb] is “returning to, coming back to (*home*)” (see §2.12.14, n. 4 above). The trilateral, like tens of others beginning with \*nw- in CA and other Semitic languages, has preserved intact a very ancient PHS proot \*naW- signifying “turning, coming back” as in Egyp. n “to turn, to come” (EHD I, 339), Eth. n’ “to go, to come” (OT, 635), etc..

1) Another term for “bees” is ‘*aubu*’<sup>213</sup>, which shares with *naubu* a similar derivational history. Abu Hanīfah (LA) sees that ‘bees’ are called ‘*aubu*’ because they come back to their hive, i.e. *dwelling* (see §2.12.14, n. 5 above).

2) One may argue, however, that CA /-b/ in [nwb] is a term for “bee”: comp. Egyp. by-t “honey” and ‘*y-by-t*’ “honey fly, i.e. *bee*” (EHD I, 39, 119), where ‘f “fly” and by-t “honey”, also Egyp. byt “honey” (EHD I, 201).

3) The signification of Egyp. phrase above is orig. (in Arabic) ‘*asalu* (= honey) *naḥl* (= bees) or ‘*uḏāfa-tu* fem. (= honey) *naḥl*, where ‘*asalu* and ‘*uḏāfa*- fem. are two of more than 80 different terms for different types, shapes, etc. of honey. To conform to HS word order, Egyp. [by-] must have been a term for “bee” and not for “honey”.

<sup>213</sup> An interesting and etymologically different trilateral is [ʿwb], which derives into *ta-ʿwību* “walking or moving all the **day-light**”. Its antonym is *ta-ʿsīdu*, ‘*īsādu* [s’d] “walking or moving all the **night**”. The word ‘*īsādu* is based on [suW] “night, evening” (§2.1.6.5.24 above).

**2.17.40** CA ‘assa “to ramble at night”, ‘as‘asa, said of the night “its darkness comes close to earth”, also ‘awasa [‘ws] expresses “to ramble at night” (Al ‘Ayn IV, 71; LA), perh. a variant of ‘awsu. All are from a compound \*‘ai- “to go, move” = Egyp. ‘w (see §3.17.10 below) and \*sa-, a reduced form of \*suW- “night”.

1) Another trilateral expressing a similar meaning is *hws*: *hawsu* “rambling at night” as a verb *hāsa* (Al ‘Ayn ibid.; LA): CA hawiy “one who is fast in moving to or in a place considered low or down (or vice-versa, according to Ibin A‘rābi): \*hW- “to go down” as in Egyp. hw “to go down, fall” ~ híw “to descend, go down”, etc. (EHD I, 444), CA hawā “to fall down, go down”. The orig. meaning of [hws] is “descend or go down *at night*”.

**2.17.41** There are trilaterals and quadrilaterals expressing special types of *eating*, *licking*, *biting*, and the like. Each consists of \*l- followed by a biliteral or trilateral. Their initial element \*l- is in some roots below from HS stem [liš] “tongue” as in Egyp. ns, Copt. ls “tongue”, as a verb Egyp ns “to devour” (EHD I, 390) = CA lassa [r. ls] “to eat, take with the tongue”; lassu “food”, with suffixed /-y/ CA lasā “eating much (said of animals); to eat”, is derived, according to LA, from lassu “food”, with prefixed caus. h- becoming part of the root halasa “to joke, speak in private”, with infixed /-h-/: lahasa “to lick (e.g. mother’s breast) without sucking” (LA, r. lhs). It is also seen with n-ext. as in Akk. lišānu “tongue”, CA lisānu, Ug., Syr. lšn, BHeb. lāšōn, Eth. lēsān id. (Rabin, 1975: 89, n. 89), and often without the /-n/ in various Hamitic branch as in Chad.: Sura, Montol liis “tongue”, Fyer lis, Krk lusu, Gera i-lis, Bokkos ‘alis, Gisiga eles, Migama li-t id., Berb. Kabyl iləs, Siwa elles “tongue” (HSED, n. 1666). To my understanding, however, [l], esp. *initial* [l] in many roots, expresses an idea like *clinging to*, *sticking to*, and the like.

**2.17.42** CA laṭa‘a “to lick with the tongue”: [ṭa‘] “to lick, eat” as in CA ṭa‘‘a “to lick” also [mṭ‘], [nṭ‘]: see §2.10.2 above, and with m-ext. CA ṭa‘ima “to taste, feed” also “eat little with the front of the teeth or mouth”, Ug., BHeb. ṭ‘m “to eat”, etc. Semitic [ṭ‘m] is undoubtedly a compound of \*ṭa‘ “to feed, eat” and \*m-.

It is interesting to note that SL laṭa‘ expresses “make s.t. sticking on s.t. else (e.g. wall) by striking it against it or pressing it on it”, the emphasis in both is on the resulting *audible noise*. It is a compound of \*[l-] plus [ṭa‘] as in ta‘‘ onomatopoeic “noise resulted from one thing *hitting* another” or from an earlier unpronounceable \*la-ḏay (see §2.10.41 above).

**2.17.43** BHeb. lā‘aṭ “to eat eagerly, devour” (OT, 524), CA la‘aṭa = “to lick with the tongue, eat by licking”, SL la‘aṭ expresses a pejorative meaning “to devour” and is certainly one of the elements of the quadrilateral [kl‘ṭ]: (t)‘al‘aṭ (i.e. \*ta-ḳal‘aṭa), much more pejorative than [l‘ṭ]. The second part of the compound is \*‘ad- “to eat”, and \*d > -ṭ because the sequence \*/l‘d/ is not permitted. The biliteral \*‘ad- is seen in §2.10.20 above. A variant trilateral [lhd] exists as in CA lahada “to lick and eat” as in the PIP of Adiy:

«wa yalhad-na mā ‘aynā (‘a)l waliyyu falam yulaθ...» (LA).

**2.17.44** CA laḥasa “to lick with the tongue”, Ge., Tna. lāḥasä “to lick”, Har., Te., Arg. lāḥasa, Amh. lasä id. (HED, 100): CA laḥwasu ~ la’wasu, with infix /-w-/, “one who eats greedily”; la’wasu ~ laywasu “glutton (said of a wolf)”<sup>214</sup> (Al ‘ayn I, 334) < \*ḥas- “to feel of, stroke lightly” (see §2.19).

Another compound containing the biliteral \*ḥas- is CA faḥasa “to lick with the tongue something on one’s hand” (ML IV, p. 478) is a compound of two biliterals {\*p- + ḥs}. The \*f- could be from Semitic \*p(w)- “mouth” as in Akk. pū, CA fū, etc., but more likely from proot ba’ (§2.13 above).

**2.17.45** Ug. lḥk “to lick” (UG, 534), BHeb. lāḥak “to lick”, said of an ox “gathers the grass with its tongue before biting it off” (OT, 518), CA laḥika “be firmly attached or fixed to, adhere, glue”; laḥaka “to sip, take into the mouth (medicine)”: PHS stem [ḥak] “touch, itch” as in CA ’iḥtakka (with people or someone) “be in touch or contact with”; CA ḥakka “to itch (the skin with fingernails or fingertips), scratch”, Akk. ekēku “to scratch”, Syr. ḥkk, Har. ḥakāka “to scratch the itching part of the body”, Ge. ḥakākä “to scratch”, Tna. ḥakākä “to scratch, itch”, Ĉ, En., Gt., Ed. akākä “to scratch when it itches”, etc. (HED, 81), Mand. hkk “to itch” (MD, 147), Cush.: Saho, Afar ḥakuk “to scratch”, Som. hoḵ-, Oromo hooḵ- (HSED, n. 1278). Thus the original meaning of the root is “to touch with the tongue”, and this is actually what the term ‘lick’ means.

**2.17.46** CA la’iḥa “to lick”; CVI ’al’aḥa “cause to lick food, feed by licking”; mil’aḥa-tu inst. “spoon”: HS stem [’aḥ] “to feed, food” as in Egyp. ’ḵ “to feed” (EHD I, 139). Changing the order of the first and second radicals results in ’alaḥa *arch.* “to eat” (see §2.17.51, n. b below).

**2.17.47** CA layḥama “to speak with a high pitch, accentuate”; mutalayḥimu “glutton” is a compound of \*l- and stem [yaḥ] “to nourish, eat; speak” as in CA yaḥama “to eat”; yuḥmu “glutton”; yaḥma-tu “word” (also yḥrm, yḥy, yḥḏ yḥf, yḥr, etc. express the same sort of meaning), Ug. tyzt “fruit” (UG, 532), as *nourishment, something that nourishes* = CA tayḥiya-tu “nourishment”, yiḥā’u “anything that nourishes”; yaḥā, yaḥaya “to nourish”.

**2.17.48** BHeb. \*lhm in *mit-lahamīm* “things greedily swallowed” (OT, 513), CA ’iltahama “to ingurgitate, swallow up greedily”, perh. Egyp. hm-t “food for the journey” (EHD I, 446), perh. CA hama-t (t = fem. pron. suffix refers to *sheep* as subject) “to graze”. By prefixing /n-/ to the proot \*ham-, CA creates a new trilateral [nhm] as in nahima “to eat hungrily, devour” is rarely used and seems to be derived from *nahimu* “glutton”, this the same /n-/ is discussed in §2.11, n. 6 above. The stem \*ham is seen Chad.: Kera hame “to eat”, Sumray ’əm id., Musgoy ḥam “to chew”, Buduma ham “to eat”, Daba həmu id. (HSED, n. 1157), Cush. \*ehm- “to eat” (RPAA, n. 781).

<sup>214</sup> In addition, CA variants ’alūs ~ ’alūs ~ la’ūs “food” (LA, r. [’ls]).

**2.17.49** CA *layifa* “to lick (= la’aḵa above); eat fast, swallow up food”, Soq. l’f “to eat”, Ge. lā’əf “to feed”, Cush.: Saho lā’if, Afar la’af. The trilateral is based on \*yup- as in CA *yuffa-tu* “food, fodder” also “grass or fodder bitten off stealthily and quickly with the mouth (by a beast of burden)”; CVIII ’iytifāfu “foddering”; ’iytaffa “to fodder” as in Poet:

«wa kunnā ’idā mā ’iytaffati (’a)l hailu *yuffatan* ...» (Al ’Ayn IV, 349; LA).

a) CA *salayafa* “to swallow up, devour” contains the causative prefix \*s- (§2.2 above) and suggests that \*yaf- above has to do with ‘eating’ or, more precisely, “rush to eat little”.

b) It possible that CA *yaf-* above is a cognate form of Egyp. ’f-t “gluttony”; ’f “a gluttonous man” ~ ’f “glutton, greedy” (EHD I, 5, 119-120), also CA ’fy ~ ’fw has to do with *food, soup*; ’afa-t, said of camels, “to graze”. Otherwise, CA *na’afa* “to eat to excess” (§2.11.68 above).

c) The second element [yaf] also expresses “to snatch away”, SL *yaff* = to rush”, hence CA *wayfu*, with prefixed w-, “speed, rapidity, running fast” > *wayafa* “to run fast, hurry, rush” (Al ’ayn IV, 451; LA), this developed from “snatch away *food*”.

d) Trilateral [lyf] must be kept distinct from HS [luγ] “language, tongue, speech” as in CA *luya-tu* id.; *layā* “to speak, talk rashly or at random” with *layuw* “rash discourse”, perh. BHeb. לַיִף in Job. 6, 3 id. (OT, 524). For proot /yaW/, see §2.13.22, keeping in mind the common interchange of /g/ and /γ/.

e) A related trilateral is Semitic [wly] “to lap, lick”, which is based on [luγ] as in BHeb. yāla’ “to lick up, swallow” (OT, 401), Akk. (w)alā’u “to lick”, CA *walaya* “to lap, drink as *dogs do*, i.e. *with the tongue*”, Te. wālāḵa ’abālā id., The root is also seen in Berber as in Kab., Mzab., Shil. elley “to lick” and in Cush. as in Bed. lak id., Ag. lanḵ “tongue” (cf. DRS VII, 554).

Cush. words above are from [laḵ] “to take, seize” as in Akk. leku “to lick, lap”, BHeb. lḵḵ “to lick, lap”, CA *laḵlaḵu*, with reduplication, “tongue”, *laḵḵa* “to lick, lap (often as *a dog does when drinking*)”, Chad.: Housa laḵe “eat greedily”, Bokkos lok “to lick” (HSED, n. 1697; OT, 527), etc. see §2.1.9.5, n. c above.

**2.17.50** CA *lamaḍa* “to take or move with the tongue what is left of food in the mouth, taste with the tongue”: CA *maḍḍa* “to suck, sip”, Ug. mṣṣ “to suck” (UG, 536), BHeb. māṣaṣ, BAram., Syr. mṣṣ “to suck” (OT, 608). The frequent interchange of /ḍ/ and /ṣ/ on the one hand, and /ḍ/ and /ṣ/ on the other hand, gives rise to mṣṣ “to suck” ~ mḍḍ and even mzz id., BHeb. mzh adj. “sucked out” (OT, 552), JAram. mz “squash, juice” (NWSI II, 606), etc.

**2.17.51** Some additional trilaterals and quadrilaterals with initial /l-/ are:

a) [lwk]: CA *lāku* “to move or push food around in the mouth”, a compound whose second element \*wk *may be* from CA *wakka* “to push, move”. The meaning of the root centers on ‘tongue’ and is very close to that of [’lk] below.

b) [’lk]: CA ‘alaka “to chew” is perh. from *lāka* above, but see §2.17.46 above.

c) [lmg]: CA lamağa “to eat, taste, suck (of a baby)”; lammāğu “food, drink”, a compound of \*l- plus a stem [mağ] “to take into the mouth (by sips)” ~ maḡ- “take into the mouth (by sucking)”, etc. see §2.4.4 above, ultimately from a proot \*’aḡ- ~ ’aḡ- “eat, drink” (§2.17.46 above).

d) [’kl]: Akk. akālu, Ug., BHeb. ’kl id. (Rabin, 1975: 87), Phoen., Pun, OAram. and all of its dialects ’kl id. (NWSI I, 51), CA ’akala “to eat”; ’aklu “food”, Sab. ’kl “grain crops, crop, meal” (SD, 4). The apparent absence of kindred triliterals, beginning with \*’k- and denoting shades of ‘eating’, strongly suggests that [’ak-], as it stands, originally had nothing to do with the notion of “eating”. It should be noted that Semitic [kl’] as in CA kala’a “to graze” has nothing to do with [’kl], and that this triliteral is derived from \*kal- “to protect, guard, safeguard” as in CA kala’a, etc. gen. Semitic id. I strongly believe that Semitic [’kl] is historically a variant of [l-’ḡ] (§2.17.46 above).

e) [lmk]: CA lamaka “to taste”; yalmaku “a strong youth”, BHeb. lmk, obsol., preserved in *Lamek*, pers. name, perh. orig. “strong youth” (OT, 523): cf. CA CVIII ’intakka of makka “to suck”.

f) [l’d]: CA la’ada “to pick up or take with *the tongue*”: CA ’adda “to bite”.

g) [l’dm]: CA la’dama “to eat the meat on the bone” < ’admu “bone”, Akk. eṣemtu, Ug. ’dm id. (Rabin, 1975: 87), BHeb. ’ešem, Ge., Te. ’aṣəm, Har. āṭ, Amh. aṭənt, etc. id. (HED, 36).

h) CA lağaḡa, said of food, “to eat it with the edge or tip of the tongue”, said of small cattle “to graze with the tip of the tongue because the grass is too short to bite off with their teeth”, a compound of \*l- and stem \*ḡaḡ-: CA ḡaḡdu “edge or tip” as a verb “to break and cut into pieces”.

#### Comments

Stem [ḡaḡ], like any other stem in HS, when is studied in depth may be used as a sample to illustrate how language develops and branches out in the course of time. The basic meaning of the stem is “to cut fast and from the root” and “break and cut in such manner”. As in many other cases (cf. §2.10.14, *Comments II* above), there is no surface or deep difference between /ḡ/ and /ḥ/, hence [ḡaḡ] expresses an identical meaning<sup>215</sup>.

Stems and proots are similar to creatures (*animals, human beings, birds, insects, snakes*) in that they multiply in the course of time; creatures multiply through different types of what we may call ‘sexual intercourse, mating, etc.’, while stems multiply only through ‘phonological and semantic differentiations’. It can be said that *phonology* and *semantics* are to ‘stems and proots’ like ‘parent’ or ‘husband & wife’ to creatures. Both structures are concomitant to each other and they constitute the deepest structure of language. All other components of language structure, esp. *syntax*, are *surface* and *secondary elements*, with or without them language exist. The role of syntax is just to make ‘communication’ clearer and more intelligible as ‘cars or planes’ in modern times makes ‘transportation’ only easier and faster. Neither *syntax* nor *cars* originate ‘language’ and ‘transportation’ respectively. The marginal role of syntax may be best

<sup>215</sup> CA ḡaḡḡa “cut fast and from the root”, ḡaḡafa “to cut the edge of”, ḡaḡḡu “a cut”; CVII ’inḡaḡaḡa “be cut”, ḡaḡama “to cut fast or rapidly”, ḡaḡā “estimate or measure s.t. and cut it”, etc.

compared to ‘teaching’ a native speaker the grammatical rules of his language which he already knows how to use and apply. For further arguments and details on this view, see §2.25, esp. n. 9b & 9c below.

As in nearly all cases, /-δ/ of /gaδ/ had been first split into three allophones [-δ], [-z], and [-d] (no [-t], [-ṭ], or [-š] because of seq. const.), later the allophones became phonemes, and the natural outcome was a huge number of traditional roots beginning with [gaδ-], [gaz-], and [gad-] differentiated from one another only in the particular shades of meaning they express. All HS roots beginning with [gaz-] “cut” in §2.1.8.1 above are from an earlier [gaδ] and so are the following roots.

a) Akk. gadāmu, CA ḡadama ~ ḡaḡama, “to cut, mutilate”, Aram., SA gdm id. A derivative of this root is Akk. gidim- “bunch of dates”, Aram. gidmā, gūdmā “branch, trunk, palm” = CA ḡidm-, ḡiḡm- (DRS II, 101).

b) BHeb. gdd “to cut (in), to hew” (OT, 178-180), BAram. gdd “to cut down” (Rosenthal, 1963:80), CA ḡadda “to cut off” ~ ḡaḡḡa above: comp. CVIII ṗiḡtaḡḡa “uproot, cut the root”.

c) BHeb. gāda’ “to cut”, Aram. gd’ id. (DRS II, 102), CA ḡd’ “to cut off (s.t. ‘high’ like the nose, etc.)”, ḡaḡa’a “trunk of a tree”, SA: Soq. godeḥ, Meh. ḡdda’ id., BHeb. giza’ id. (OT, 188).

d) CA ḡaḡara “to cut”; ḡaḡru “root”.

e) CA ḡaḡafa “to cut”; maḡḡūfu pp. “cut” ~ ḡaḡafa “to cut”; maḡḡūfu pp. “cut”, BHeb., Aram., Syr. gdp, CA ḡdf, SA gdf “blaspheme, revile, reproach”, from ‘use cutting words’: comp. CA sabba “to cut” also “to curse, insult”, etc.

f) More traditional roots can be obtained by dissimilating the first /-δ-/ of [gaḡḡa] to a liquid, namely /-r-/ and /-l-/ (for dissim., see §2.17.80 below), hence CA ḡurḡu “big rat”, Meh. ḡiret id., Berb.: So. agerda id. (VPHS, n. 208), Egyp. grt “rat” also “mole” (EHD II, 809), and CA ḡlḡ “blind rat”, whose pl. form *manā-ḡiḡ*, which tells about the origin of the singular form. However, old Arab scholars treated the pl. form as being from a different root [nḡḡ]. One derivative of this root is *nawāḡiḡu* “wisdom teeth” with no sg. form, though we may reconstruct \*nāḡiḡu. The [nā-] here = nā- in *nābu* “canine tooth”. For its final [-b-], see §2.2.20 above. The compound consists of two element [nā] “tooth”, i.e. *sinnu* + \*-ba “cutting, i.e. *ḡāḡi*”, and it is described in Arabic as *sinnun* (tooth) *ḡāḡi* (cutting) = *canine*. The derived verb *naḡaḡa* expresses “to bite severely (with canine teeth)”. The fact that the verb *naḡaḡa* is shoter than the noun (*nawāḡiḡu*, \*nāḡiḡu) is a grace since it reveals the deeper morphological structure of the compound word: for a discussion of this phenomenon, see §2.25, n. 4c below.

**2.17.52** CA lahḡa-tu “dialect, accent, tongue”, BHeb. lahag “study of letters, learning” (OT, 513): PHS stem \*hag- in Ug. hgg “to speak” (UG, 536), CA haḡā “speak ill of, satirize”, BHeb. higgāon “speech, murmur”, Targ., Syr. hegā, Mand. hga “pronounce, read”, Te. tā-haga “speak”, see §2.4.23 above.

**2.17.53** CA lahaḡa “to heave, i. e. lit. to hang or move out the tongue from the mouth as when one (dog, etc.) is thirsty or tired (LA, r. lhḡ), a compound of \*l- “tongue” and \*hḡ- as in CA haḡḡa “move forward and backward”. The meaning of [lhḡ] is therefore self-



evident.

**2.17.54** CA *lasa'a*, according to one account (said of a scorpion, etc.) “to bite with the tail”, according to another (said of a snake, etc.) “to bite with the tongue”, also “to bite, sting, hurt (with words)” (LA). The word is a compound of \**la-* “tongue” and \**θu'-b-ān* [*r. θ'b*]<sup>216</sup> “male snake, serpent, eel”, this is in turn a compound of \**θu'* or \**θa'* “female snake”, and \**b* denoting masc. gender (for \**-b* see §2.23.6 below), and *-ān* is a determiner like *-ān* in Semitic *liš-ān* “tongue”, etc. The change of the order of phonemes concomitant with the interchange of /*-b-*/ and /*-m-*/ does not affect the semantic content: \**uθm-ān* “large serpent” also “young of eel”.

1) Because of the frequent interchange between /*f*/ and /*θ*/ in CA, I suspect that there is a relation between [*θu'*] and \**p'*, a PHS term for “viper, serpent” (§2.3.25 above). Suffixing \**-b* to [*f'*-] gives rise to an unpronounceable \**f'b* and thus unpermitted word. Therefore, *θu'bā-nu* may be from \**pu'bā-nu*, and after adding /*'*-/: \**'up'ubā-nu* (for this perplexing /*'*-, see §2.3.25 above). This PSem. form, with or without \**'u-*, cannot be pronounced because it includes an unpermitted sequence \**-p'b-*. Even if you replace /*'*-/ by any other Semitic consonant like *-t-*, *-ʾ-*, *-s-*, *-h-*, *-k-*, *-ḏ-* and so forth, you will always get a word impossible to pronounce. The sequential constraint is due only to the suffixing of \**-b* to \**p'*-. To preserve the word with some minor and predictable phonetic change, CA has changed the suffix /*-b-*/ to /*-w-*/. Thus \**uf'uwā-nu* = *θu'bā-nu* (you may add initial *'u-* and say *'uθ'ubānu* if you wish), defined as “male snake, serpent” (Tha'ālibi, FL, p. 159).

Furthermore, changing the order of radicals without any important change of meaning is possible as long as we take into consideration the phonotactics of the language: \**uθmā-nu* masc. “large snake, young of serpent”. Note that one can neither say \**'uθbā-nu* nor \**'uθfā-nu*.

2) Some examples of interchange of /*f*/ and /*θ*/ are: CVIII *'iytafa* ~ *'iytaθa* “to eat (of horses)”; *γuffa-tu* ~ *γuθθa-tu* “fodder” [*γaf*, but also *γaθ*], *falaya* ~ *θalaya* “to split, cleave” [*fal*], *θarwa-tu* ~ *farwa-tu* “wealth, plenty of, much” [*θr*], etc. Siyyūti's Muzhir I, p. 465, LA; *θumma* ~ *fummu* “then, afterward”, *'aθāfi* ~ *'aθāθi* “three stones put round a fire and on which one places a cooking-pot or meat to roast”, etc. Ibin Jinni (Khaṣā'iṣ II, 84); *fadmu* ~ *θadmu* “stupid, evil” [*fdm*], *daθaqa* ~ *dafaqa* “to pour out (water) rapidly”, *daθθu* ~ *daffu* “side”, *daθīna-tu* ~ *dafīna-tu* etc. (LA); CVII *'infağara* ~ *'inθağara* “to gush”, [*ğ'θ*] ~ [*ğ'f*] “dismay”, etc. Bin Faris (ML I, 371, 501). SL, *faḥm* “charcoal” ~ *θaḥm* (CA *faḥmu* id.), etc. In SL and also in CA *θayr* “gate, opening; mouth”, Egyp. š'r “door, gate” (EHD II, 723), Ug. θyr, BHeb. š'r “gate”. In addition, SL *faḡar* “to open (wide) the mouth” = CA *fağara* “to open (wide)” as in the Poet. (Humaid Bin Thaur):

«... wa lam *tafğar* bimañṭiḡihā famā».

BHeb. pā'ar “to open wide, to gape”, Syr. p'r id. (OT, 860), perh. Cush.: Som. fur- “to open, free, untie”, Oromo, rendille, konso fur-, Gidar furi-yye id. (HSED, n. 827). One can drop /*-r*/ without affecting the signification: cf, Heb. p'h, Syr. p'y, Mand. paa “to

<sup>216</sup> The interchange of /*θ*/ and /*s*/ is not uncommon, esp. in CA.

open the mouth”. Drower and Macuch (MD, 359) cite CA bayā “to bleat” as cognate. The direct cognate is fayw “mouth” as a verb: fayā, said of flowers, etc., lit. “to open, bloom”<sup>217</sup>.

3) The voiceless interdental /-θ-/ of \*laθ’u “biting” has given rise to, at least, two trilateral:

3a) ladaʿa, like lasa’a, expresses “to bite, sting (viper)”.

The verb also denotes “to bite or sting (with taunts or reproaches), hurt or injure (by words)”. The trilateral developed from [lδ’] (see below) via \*lada’a, which is impossible to pronounce.

3b) laḏa’a “to bite, sting (with the tongue, i.e. *with words*). The basic meaning of laḏ’u is “a burning like that of the fire”, hence “to hurt, i.e. *sting*, with embers or fire” (Al ‘Ayn II, 99). In *Hadith*: «lā yulsa’u or lā yulḏa’u (‘a)l mu’minu min ḡuḥrin marratain» (LA, Is’)<sup>218</sup>. SL rightly employs in this *Hadith* only vb *yulḏayu* since ‘ḡuḥrin’ is a ‘*hole of snake*’. This use reflects a continuation of ‘*correct usage*’ prevalent in pre-Islamic CA. Consider the following verse of PIP Antarah:

«...yafīrī ‘awāḡibahā ka ladyi (‘a)l ‘arḡami» (ŠM, p. 258, L. 118), where *ladyi* ‘al ‘arḡami = *biting of serpent*.

**2.17.55** Ug. g’r “to reprimand”, Heb. ga’ar “to rebuke, reprove, chide”, Syr., Jp. ge’ar id., Mand. gharta “cry, noise”, Ge. gā’arā “to bellow”, Te. gā’ara id., Amh. gəṛəggər “make a confused noise (crowd)”, Har. girgir bāya “be noisy” (HED, 75; DRS III, 167; OT, 200), CA ḡa’ara “to ask with a loud voice, to supplicate with wailing and lamentation; to low”, MSA ḡa’ara “to howl, cry aloud, make a deep and loud sound”: SL ža’ar “make a very loud (lit. ‘ālī, i.e. *lofty, high*) cry”, one who does this is called ḡa’wār, while ža’ar, CIII žā’ar “to argue with a loud voice”, All are from a compound of \*g “sound, voice” (see §2.11.58 above) and stem \*ar- perh. “rising” (see §2.11.49).

**2.17.56** Akk. būru, būrtu “a well (of water), water place” ~ būru, OAram. byr’, Moab. br id., BHeb. bə’ēr “a well”, Pun. be’r id., ESA b’r, Soq. ‘ebhor id., CA bi’ru, pl. ‘ābāru (pl. of *abundance* bi’āru, pl. of *paucity* (or *fewness*) ‘ab’uru ~ ‘ab’āru), Phoen. bwr, Ug. b’r “well, water place” (DRS II, 41; Tyloch, 1975: 56-57, n. 7; OT, 109), Cush.: Som. boor- “to dig”; boor “pit”, Oromo bor- “to dig”, Arbore biir “to bore”, Chad.: Zul yabori “to dig”, Fyer ḡur, Bokkos ḡor id., Lele biir “to dig” (HSED, n. 319, 276) = CA ba’ara “to dig, e.g. *a well*”, Sab. b’r id. (SD, 25), etc.

1) HS [b’r] is prob. a compound comprising two proots \*baW- “home, i.e. *a natural*

<sup>217</sup> Furthermore, in Arabic dialects, including Leb., *tem(m)* “mouth” is not directly from CA famu id., but rather from \*θem(m), which is ultimately the same as *famu*. It is really amazing to find that CA *θamūmu*, said of a sheep, expresses “(uprooting grass, etc.) with the mouth”. A variant form *tamūmu* is found in CA and considered ‘*faulty speech*’ (Tha’ālibi, FL, p. 158).

<sup>218</sup> Both variants are in use in SL, but are associated (esp. lā yulḏa’u) *only* with ‘*fire*’ and never with ‘*ḡuḥrin*’, which requires in SL only *lā yulḏayu*. Examination of the etymologies of such words in CA reveals that their usages in SL are correct. It seems evident that LA miscopied the *Hadith*.

*hole, cave, place, etc.*” and a stem -’ir- “water”:

1a) The first part of the compound is seen in CA *bā’a-tu* “house or home of people, being in front of a valley or in an elevated land (mountain) overlooking a valley”, according to one account, or just “house or home” in any place, according to another (cf. Al Ayn VIII, 411). Abu Zaid, however, adds “house or home facing a river”<sup>219</sup> (LA, r. bw’); CIV ’abā’a, CV tabauwa’a “to dwell” as in the Koran: *نَتَّبُوا مِنَ الْجَنَّةِ حَيْثُ نَشَاءُ* (And God has made us inherit the earth) *we may dwell in the Garden wherever we please* (39: 74). Egyp. b’b’ “hole, hiding place”; also b, b’, bw, etc. “abode, house”, etc. see §2.9.22 above.

1b) The second part of the compound is seen in Egyp. *ír, ywr* “river” (EHD I, 143, 35) > BHeb. *yə’ōr*. A reflex of this proot is seen in CA *’ara-ti*, said of the sky or the wind, “to pour little by little”; *’arwānu* (meaning?) having to do with ‘a well’, *’aryu*, said of clouds, “pouring forth abundantly” (SHH VI, 2266): see §3.4.28 below.

4) Another trilateral based on \*bW- is seen in Akk. Assyr. *bību* “orifice d’écoulement”, Aram.: Jp. *bābītā*, Syr. *būbyā* “canal”, Talm. *bībā* “tuyau d’écoulement” (DRS II, 50), CA *bību* “an opening (lit. small window) for water to flow”, a compound of \*bW- + \*’ab- “water”, Egyp. b’b’-t “flowing stream” (EG, 563).

5) Egyp. *ír ~ ywr* and CA *w’r* above in (1b) are cognates and both are derived from a compound consisting of \*’aw- “house, abode, room, and the like” as in Egyp. *yw* “house, room”, CA *ma-’wā*, etc. see §2.22.14. As one would expect, the compound has been preserved in CA *’uwra-tu* fem. “pit in the ground collecting water” and *’awuwru*, i.e. *أور* *’wwr*, “sky” (LA), from “home of water; i.e. *of rain*”.

**2.17.57** Sem. [bħr I] in Sab. *h-bħr* caus. “to earmark animal as a sacrifice” = pre-Islamic CA *baħara* “to cut lengthwise the ear of the so-called *baħīra-tu*, a *sheep or she-camel*”, and this happens when it gives birth to five kids. It will be abandoned completely and left alone in the pasture. The Koran (3: 103) forbids this practice and other similar practices.

1) Sem. [bħr] “cut the ear” appears to me as a compound of two elements: the 1<sup>st</sup> is a proot \*ba- “cut” (see §2.2.20 above) and the 2<sup>nd</sup> [ħur] “ear”. Egyp. *bħ* “to cut, tear, break, hack” (EHD I, 220-221) could be from two elements \*ba and ħuW-, with loss of the very special meaning they originally stood for: see below.

1a) The second element is seen in CA *ħurra-tāni* [ħr] fem. dual “ear” and in *maħāra-tu*, from [ħwr] (LA), “bottom of the ear”. A variant *hurru* exists in some old dialects (see below). All are ultimately from a proot \*ħ(w)- “ear”, seen in Egyp. *ħħwí* “the two ears” (EHD I, 508) and in some other CA compound trilaterals.

1b) A compound containing the proot \*ħ(w)- is seen in CA *ħuṭlu*, said of animals like

<sup>219</sup> Abu Zaid’s definition deserves some consideration because it implies that the choice of a *dwelling* depends on the presence of ‘water’ near it. From here we may understand Egyp. b’b’-t “flowing stream, source of a river”.

a sheep, dog, etc., “(having) long ears” (LA, r. ḥṭl; Amāli I, p. 36) is from \*ḥ(w)- “ear” plus \*ṭ-l- “long”: cf. CA ṭūlu “length, tallness”; ṭawīlu “long, tall” (§2.14.1 above). It is to be noted that \*ḥuṭlu cannot occur because of seq. const.

1c) It is amazing to find in CA *ḥuḏnu* “ear” besides *’uḏnu* id., the most common HS word for ‘ear’, as in Akk. *uznu*, Ug. *’udn*, BHeb. *’ozen*, Aram. *’dn*, Sab. *’ḏn*, Eth. *’zn*, etc. (DRS I, 10), Egyp. *ydn* “ear” (EHD I, 103), Chad.: Jegu *’uduṇe*, Brg *uduṇi* “ear” (HSED, n. 126). Another CA variant is [ḥḏn] and occurs only in the dual form *ḥuḏna-tāni*. According to Abu Maṣṣūr (see LA), *this form is a faulty speech and the correct form is ḥuḏna-tāni*; both dual forms are indeed difficult to pronounce, and the criterion of ‘ease of pronunciation’ may suggest that *ḥu-ḏn* was the original form.

a) [bḥr]: in Akk. *bēru* “essayier, éprouver”, Syr. *beḥar* “examimer, essayer”, CA CV *tabaḥḥara* “chercher à approfondir” (DRS II, 56), BHeb. *bāḥar* “to examine, prove” (OT, 122-123), Mand. *bhr* “to try out, test, choose out, examine” (MD, 53).

b) [bḥθ] in CA *baḥaṯa* “to search, investigate”, in Akk. “to examine” (NWSI I, 150, bḥš), Mand. *bḥaš* “to search, examine” (DRS II, 57), SL *baḥbaš* (from \**baḥbaθ*), by partial reduplication, “to search (carefully or everywhere)”.

c) [bḥn] in BHeb. *bāḥan* “to try, prove, put to test”, BAram. *bḥn*, Syr. *baḥḥen* “to examine, try” (OT, 122), OffAram. *bḥn* “to examine” (NWSI I, 150), CA CVIII *’imtaḥana* (from \**’ibtaḥana*) “to examine”; *’imtiḥānu* “examination, test”. It is quite evident that CA /m-/ in the triliteral [mḥn] is from \*b-.

d) The just cited trilaterals show evidence of a linguistic phenomenon undetected by old Arab scholars. A semivowel, esp. /-w-/, can be substituted for the medial radical /-ḥ-/ , esp. in [bḥr] and [bḥθ], without affecting the basic meaning expressed by the group at all. This phenomenon may suggest that the basic meaning lies in [baW-], but that the signification of stem \*-ḥ- may be the same as that expressed by [baW]. As for the third radical, i.e. [-r, -θ, & -n], it could be either a preposition or object of the verb.

1) CA *bur-tu* [bwr] “I test, examine; experiment”, CI *bāra*, CVIII *’ibtāra*, Akk. *bāru* “paraître sûr, prouvé” Cohen (DRS II, 41), BHeb. [bwr] as in בּוּר /būr/ “to search out, examine, prove” (OT, 120, 163).

2) CA *bāṯa* [bwθ] “to search, investigate” (LA). Two trilaterals are based on *bāṯa*: [nbθ] ~ [nbš] “to dig (for) in order to extract”. We can substitute [-ḥ-] or [-’-] for [-w-] in [bwθ], but this particular substitution is conditioned by suffixing [-r] to the new combination (as infixing /-n-/ in English *passage* is conditioned by suffixing /-r/ to the new combination): *baḥṯara* ~ *ba’ṯara* “to extract and uncover or manifest” (also “scatter everywhere *in the process or act of searching for s.t.*”). As we will see below, the two pharyngeals may not be two variants of one single form, but rather two constituent elements of a proot impossible to pronounce twice [ḥa’]; some old dialects dropped /-ḥ-/ and some others dropped /-’-/. In addition, /-w-/ is not a mere substitute for /-ḥ-/ as mentioned above, but a grammatical element that was once present in the roots.

3) CA *bāna* “appear, become visible”, CII “to demonstrate, show”; *baiyina-tu* fem. “evidence, proof”, etc. For HS cognates see §2.13.24, n. 5b below.

Evidence drawn from Egyp. shows that Semitic trilaterals are compounds of two elements: \*ba’ + -ḥa’ as in Egyp. *wb’* “examine, pry into, open the eyes, look” (EHD I,

158) and *wh'* “examine into, inspect” (EHD I, 178). Both Egyp. roots are from \*ba' as in Egyp. *b'b'g'* “to examine carefully, scrutinize” and \*ħa' as in Egyp. *ħ'* “to examine into, spy into” respectively.

**2.17.59** HS [bħr III] expresses “place collecting water; pond, sea” as in Sab. *bħr* “sea” (SD, 27), CA *baħru* masc. “sea”, Ge. *baħər* “sea”, Tna. *baħri*, Te., Har. *bāħar*, Gt., E., N., Go. *bar*, Ed. *bahar* id., etc. (HED, 40), Syr. *baħrā* id, Akk. *bērt* “cours d'eau” (DRS I, 56) = CA *baħra-tu* fem. “pond”, Chad.: Kera *vor* “sea, river”, Sura *voğor* “rivulet” (HSED, n. 305).

1) Old Arab philologists derived [bħr] “sea” from “(wide) crack in the earth's surface with water in it” as in *baħara* “to split open (the ground) and widen, dig out (a well) and widen” (LA), hence *baħru* also expresses “crack” = Sab. *h-bħr* caus. “to dig out (a well)” (SD, 28).

2) It is possible that the word has some elements in common with the term *bi'ru* “well, spring of water”, and that the available evidence permits me to divide it into a proot [baW] “place” (§2.17.56 above) and a stem \*ħaur<sup>220</sup>.

2a) Proot [baw] is seen in §2.17.56 above and also in CA *bawdu* “well, spring of water” (for \*-d-, see §3.11.4 above).

2b) Stem \*ħaur is seen in Egyp. *ħwr* “a mass of water”, perh. CA *hawru* “lake”, Sab. *hwr* “watercourse, pond, cistern”. It is possible that \*ħawr is a compound of a proot *ħaw* “abundance, surplus, plenty” as in Egyp. *ħw* id. (EHD I, 469) and stem \*War “water” (§2.17.56 above). Proot [ħaw] may be present in CA *baħūmu* adj., preserved in Poet. and said of a pond or brook “with copious water”, etc.

**2.17.60** HS [bn- ~ br-] is the root from which words for ‘son’ and ‘daughter’ are traditionally derived. The original signification of the root is prob. “giving existence to, bringing forth, creation” as in Assy. *ban-* “make, form, build, create, beget” (King, 1989: 339), CA *banā* “to build, construct”, etc. Similar meanings are express by *bar-* as in Sab. *br'* “to build, construct” also “create (God)” (SD, 30), CA *bara'a* “to create, make (God)”; *bāri'u* “creator, God”, BHeb. *bārā* “to form, create, produce, make; beget, bring forth” (OT, 155), Aram. *bārā* “to create (God)”, Mand. *bra* id.

1) Akk., CA *binu* “son”, Ug., Phoen., Pun., Moab., EBHeb., Sab. *bn* id.; Akk., CA *bintu* “daughter; girl”, Phoen., Pun., EBHeb. *bt* (\*bnt), Sab. *bnt*, *bt*, etc. id. The root is also seen in Egyp. as in *bn* “to copulate”; *bnw* “male, man”.

2) In Aram. and some other Semitic languages the corresponding root is \*bar- as in OAram. *br* “son”, pl. *bn* (from \*bryn = CA *bnyn* (pronounced *banīnu*), pl. of *binu*), *brh* “daughter”, etc. gen. Aram., SA *brw*, Meh. *habrê*, Shh. *br* “son”, Soq. *bar* “enfant” (NWSI I, 168ff, 188ff; DRS I, 70; Rosenthal, AG, 9; SD, 29). Also belong here Soq. *bere*, Meh. *būrū*, Šh. *buri* “mettre au monde, enfanter”; Soq. *bérhe* “père”; *bóreh* “mère”, etc. (DRS II, 80). Besides, CA *barā* [r. bry] “creatures, mankind” ~ *bariyya-tu* ~ (only some old Arab grammarians derived it from \*bari'ya-tu “creatures, mankind”) ~ *warā* id. also *wara'* “son's son”, Chad.: Gera *bar-mi* “person”, Mburku *bar-gi* id., Galambu

<sup>220</sup> It is less likely that \*b- of *b'r* and [bħr] is a term for “water”, 'r “river”, and *ħawr* “lake”, and that their orig. meanings are “water of river” and “water of lake” respectively.

mbər pl. id., Gisiga mburo “man, person”, Bachama ḥwara id., Gabri barua, Dorma bora, Ndam bər id., Housa bēra “young girl”, Angas par “child”, Berb.: Ayr a-barar “son”, Ahaggar a-burir, Tawlemmet barar “son”, Cush.: Afar bara “man” (HSED, n. 213, 214). It seems that Hamito-Semitic had two variant stems: \*ban- and \*bar-, ult. fr. the proot in Egyp. b “people”, ba’ “soul” (EHD I, 197).

3) It may be interesting to note that not only \*-n and \*-r can be suffixed to \*baW- to form derivatives expressing shades of its underlying meaning, but also a number of other different suffixes like /-š/ in bawšu “people from different tribes” also “herd of different animals (e.g. cows, sheep, goats, etc.)”, bawlu “self or soul, son, offspring”, bauwu, lit. “son of a she-camel”, etc. The proot can also take prefixes in CA (see below).

Of the three trilaterals cited at the end of the foregoing paragraph, only [bwš] exists in SL and is perceived as a compound of \*baw- above and \*-š, a proot signifying “different”. For the two other trilaterals, while I am sure that \*-w of bauwu signifies both small and masc. and is linguistically identical with that of ḡarwu, falwu, ḡarwu, etc., I can’t figure out the real meaning of [-l-].

The proot \*-š is also seen in hubāš-ātu ~ ḥubāš-ātu pl. “people from different tribes”: ta-habbaša ~ ta-’abbaša, said of people, “to gather together”. Of course, this is not from [bš] “to smile, etc.”, but from bawšu “people from different tribes”. The pl. of the coll. bawšu is ’awbāšu, which has given rise to wabšu sg. “bad”, SL and other dialects wabš “bad, stupid, and worthless person”, perh. orig. ‘foreign’. The pl. form ’awbāšu has a variant form ’awšābu “peoples from different tribes”, which has led to the creation of a new root [wšb] in the language. It seems to me that hubāšā-tu above is directly based on habiy “child, boy” plus a proot [š].

#### Comments

To my understanding, /š-/ signifies in many traditional roots *a thing getting far from its source or origin; a thing splits off from a larger thing, piece, body, community; a thing breaks off from a main body*, e.g. when people are far from their homeland and scattered in many foreign countries, they are said to be in šatātu or mu-šattatūn, etc. Another illustrative example, as *a bomb explodes, its splints break off and scattered away in all directions; splints are called šaḍāyā*: fem., sg. šaḍiyya-tu “splint, piece”. This last example is from MSA and the very same picture is depicted by CA CV tašaḍḍā as in Poet.

«ka(’a)d durataini ta-šaḍḍā ’anhumā (’a)š ṣḍafu», *like two pearls whose shells were broken off*.

Another derivative is šaḍā *a tiny bone sticking to a horse’s upper arm; if it moves away (in any direction) from its place, it is said šaḍiyya* (ṢḤḤ VI, 2392).

The notion ‘far’ above implies all directions, esp. *vertical and horizontal dimensions*, e.g. wāsi’u signifies just “spacious, broad”, whereas šā-si’u “far-stretched” [ša’ + sa’]; one can say *the land of the U.S.A. is šasi’ah* (fem.) *as compared with that of Lebanon; the distance between earth and sun or between earth and sky is šāsi’ah*. Another example is šāhiḡ, used with ‘height of the highest mountaintops’, with “very tall

buildings”, etc., [ša’ + hiḳ = “tall”]: see §2.10.7 above<sup>221</sup>.

**2.17.61** The [-r] and [-n] seen in \*br and \*bn- “son” above are *possibly* the same as those seen in words for “man” in Hamito-Semitic languages:

1. [mar] in Akk. māru “son”, OAram., OffAram., Sammal, Hatra, Palm., Nab. mr’ “lord, master”, JAram. mry id., BAram. mārē id., Chad.: DB maar “boy”, Fyer mara “masculine”, Mig maar “uncle”, Mbu mar “slave”, Gudu mār, Bachama murey “man”, Cush.: Sid. mur “infant”, Sab mr’, pl. ’mr’ “man, lord”; mr’t “lady” (SD, 87), CA mar’u or ’imri’u “man”, mar’atu or ’imra’atu “woman” also, up to the 1<sup>st</sup> century of the Islamic era, “lady or *supreme lady*” (LA)<sup>222</sup>, Egyp. mr “hero, brave man” also “friend(s)”, mr-t “serf”, mry “female slave”, (NWSI II, 682-683; HSED, n. 1727, 1740; EHD I, 311).

#### Comments I

Akk. long /a/ of the 1<sup>st</sup> syllable of māru is phonologically unjustifiable unless it is a reflex of a lost weak radical /w, y, or ’/. This /-ā-/ persists in all derivatives as in *mārat* “daughter”, pl. *mārātu*; *mārūtu* “sonship”, *mār mārī* “grandson” (= CA ’ibin ’ibin id., i.e. *son’s son*); *mārē ali* “townsfolk”, etc.

2) [man] “man” as in Cush.: Sid. mannō “man”, maana “people”, Kaf. mannō “brother”, (Kastellino, 1975: 339), Som. mun “male”, Hadiya maana “people”, Darasa maana, Tambaro maan id., Chad.: Polchi mēni, Dwot, Bar mani, Buli mən, Bolewa menni, Logone meeni, Geji māni, Sayanchi mwan id. (HSED, n. 1722). In CA the proot is preserved in *mu-mannu* “bastard, a person without recognizable father”.

2a) Both stems may *probably* go back to a proot \*ma’- or \*mau- seen in Egyp. my “son; spurn”, Cush.: Arb mo “man”, Hozo mo, Sezo mao, Iraqw mu “people”, Kwdza me’-iko id., Gawata mi’ay “baby, boy”, Chad.: Dera mu “man”, Tangale muu, pl. mi id., Logone mi “people” (HSED, n. 1764, 1787).

3) Among many traditional roots that are *possibly* based on the doubtful \*maW-, we mention two:

3a) Akk. mutu “man, husband”, Ug. mt, Eth. met id.: CA matta “be related to (through *blood-relationship*)”, Egyp. mt “man, male”. The doubled root of CA [mtt] may suggest the former presence of a weak radical /w, y, or ’/, becoming by regressive assimilation /-t-/.

3b) Akk. am-tu “female slave”, Phoen., Pun., Ug., Heb., Aram. ’m-t, CA ’ama-tu id. The masculine form \*’am “slave, servant” has been preserved only in CA in a pre-Islamic pers. name *taymu llāhi* = ’*abdu llāhi* = slave/servant + llāhi “of god”. The word *taymu* consists of \*ta- plus \*’amu > \*ymu.

4) It is amazing that notions like “know, learn, teach” are derived from the word [ma] “mother” and not from [ba] “father”.

<sup>221</sup> Some other meanings of [ša’] are: “ability to see far things” as in šai’-ān “far-sighted” as a vb ša’a. The verb also signifies “scatter”; ’išta’a CVIII arch. “be first, precede” also *arch.* “listen”; n. mutaša’i. “different” (see §2.11.8 above).

<sup>222</sup> It is amazing that *mar’u* has no pl. form from the same root. The pl. *mar’ūn* was formed in the 1<sup>st</sup> century of the Islamic era by analogy with pl. in -ūn, but in that century was of rare use.

## Comments II

The foregoing analysis of esp. mar-/man- “man” into compounds has been largely influenced by their kindred roots. I am aware, however, that [r-] = “man (male)” (§2.15.20 above, etc.), but there is no evidence on [n-] = “woman (female)”. With the absence of such evidence, the above analysis remains plausible. However, one thing bothers me here and makes me skeptical about the analysis: *mar’u* sg. “man”: *warā* pl. “human beings”. The question arises here: isn’t /wa-/ the same pl. marker used in Egyp. and Semitic, esp. CA, as a suffix (see 2.9, n. a under *Comments* above & 2.22.2, ft 2 below). Suppose that /wa-/ is a pl. prefix, in this case /m-/ will certainly be a type of ‘determiner’ or ‘classifier’. The reason for this *hesitation* is due to the fact that I strictly follow here what my mind tells: *since mt, my, mr, which express similar meanings, have in common /m-/. This /m-/ has to be the proot.* In fact, what ‘logic’ and ‘mind’ dictate does not necessarily apply to this level of language analysis. It may turn out, one day, that -t, -’ay, and -r are the real proots. All are recognizable proots in HS. Read carefully my *Comments* in §2.11.90 above and n. 4 of §2.17 above, bearing in my that not everything glitters is ‘gold’.

**2.17.62** A very strange CA word including a proot /š-/ is *šihdāra-tu* fem. “prater” from *haḏara* “to prate” < *haḏā* “to prate, rave, talk irrationally”. The only meaning that can be assigned to *ši-* is nothing but “one who”<sup>223</sup>.

**2.17.63** CA *zabību* coll. “raisin”, defined in LA as *ḏāwī* (= withered, drying up) ‘*al*’ (= the) ‘*inabu*, the gen. HS coll. term for “grapes”. For [za-] (< *ḏāwī*), see §2.3.33 above. The very same stem [-bīb] is seen in *ṣirbīb* “black grapes” (§2.7.29, under *Comments* below).

**2.17.64** CA *ḥirsimu* “poison”, a compound of \**ḥir-* (in CA *ḥurr* “thin snake, gentle snake”, Egyp. *ḥrr* “serpent, worm”) and \**simu* “poison” (in CA *sammu*, *simmu* id., Akk. *šammu*, BHeb. *šam*, Syr. *šamā* id.). Accordingly, the original meaning of the compound may be “poison from this special kind of snake”.

A basic question rises whether CA-Egyp. [*ḥir* ~ *ḥur*] above is or is not identical with [*ḥir*] in *ḥirbīš* ~ *ḥirbiš* ~ *ḥirfiš* “ader” in §2.23.9 below. It seems, however, that /-r-/ of such words have been brought about by dissimilation (§2.17.80 below).

As for the ultimate origin of the word under study, it is a compound of proot [g- or ḥ-] (see §2.17.83 below) and stem [sam]. It is interesting to note that the compound is also seen, as one should expect, in CA *ḡursumu* ~ *ḡirsāmu* “poison”.

**2.17.65** An interesting compound is CA *ḥarāsīnu* “droughty or hot years” whose surface

---

<sup>223</sup> An etymologically different \*s- or \*š- is seen in CA *sabraḡa* expressing an idea that may render “make blind”. It is used when you look for s.t. near you or in front of you and you don’t see it or you pass by s.o. (you are looking for) and you don’t see him. It is often used in neg. as in *May God blind his eyes so that he does not see ...*: *brḡ* “beautify oneself (woman) to attract the eyes” as in Poet. «*ta-barruḡu* (’a)l ’*unḡā tašaddat li* (’a)ḡ *ḡakar*»: *bar-* “to see”, esp. in Akk. and CA. The same morpheme is also seen in BHeb., Aram. *snwr* “blind”: *nwr* “shine” (§2.17.1 above).



structure suggests a compound of ḥar- “hot, droughty” and sīn- “years”. The first part is seen in CA ḥārru “hot”; ḥirra-tu “thirst”; ḥarāratu “heat”, Assy. arūrtu “drought”; arāru “be hot”, Heb. ḥārar id. (King, 1898: 325). The second element \*-sīnu = CA sinīnu “years”, pl. of sana-tu fem. “year” (Ug. šnt, OArām., BHeb. šnh, etc. id.).

Comparison of the two CA plural forms \*-sīnu and sinīnu above reveals that the root radical /-n-/ of sana-tu has been dropped. The same phenomenon appears in ḥarāsīmu “droughty years” in which the final /-m-/ is another plural ending found in CA only as part of the root: cf. BHeb. šānā “year” > pl. šānīm, Ug. rḥt “hand” > pl. rḥtm. This new fact suggests that /-n-/ of sana-tu is a proot. It is also important to note that the word order in both words is not in harmony with that of CA since the adj. precedes the noun it modifies. Apart from ‘word order’, the morphological structure of ḥrsn/-m includes a proot [ḥ-] = [g-] in §2.17.83 below, infixed /-r-/, and a stem [san]: comp. with stem [θan] in §2.3.50 above. See, however, §2.2.57.4 above.

**2.17.66** CA *burθuḡāniyyatu*, [r. brθḡ], lit. “the whitest, most delicious and precious grain” is obviously a compound whose first element \*bur- is one of HS words for “grain, wheat” as in Akk, CA burru, BHeb. bar, Soq. bor, etc. see §2.12.42, n. 1 above. The signification of the second element is bound to be ‘white < snow’, owing to the fact that ‘white grain’ is both ‘delicious’ and ‘precious’. However, since anything which is “intensely white” in Arabic is described ‘white like the snow’, it seems that the word *θaḡḡu* lies beneath Semitic \*θlg “snow”: cf. Akk. šalgu, BHeb. šeleg, Syr. talgā, Mand. talga id. (MD, 478), CA θalḡu id.; adj. θulāḡiy lit. “most white”. Its 1<sup>st</sup> /-ḡ-/ dissimilates to /l/: See [θag] in §2.11.82 above and dissim. in §2.17.80 below.

**2.17.67** CA CIV ‘afāša (said of anything one grips tightly with the fingers) = ‘infaraḡa-t ‘aṣābi’hu ‘an, i.e. *as the firm grip with the fingers is lessened, the thing (they grip) gets free*, i.e. *separates itself from the tight grip*, neg. lam ya-fiṣ = he/it (could) not free it/himself, i.e. *not separate oneself from* > developed into “stay; still” = مابرح (mā bariḡa) (Al ‘ayn VII, 165-166; LA).

1) Can one imagine that fāḡa, for example, “to overflow, inundate (water)” meant orig. “*separate itself from whatever enveloping it, sheltering it, impeding its going out*, etc. + water” (§2.17.12 & 2.11.3 above). Numerous trilaterals containing the deep proot \*fa’- or \*faW- are found in Semitic. This very same proot also expresses “rising, lifting up” and is also seen in Egyp. f’ as in f’ ḥr “lift up the face” (ḥr = face), f’ ‘ “lift up the hand and arm” (‘ = hand).

**2.17.68** CA *bāša*, *nāša*, and *fāša* in the PIP of Imri’ Al Qais has attracted my attention. The ode begins with:

’amin ḡikri Salmā ’an na’atka *tanūšu*  
fataḡsuru ’anhā ḡuṭwatan ’aw *tabūšu* (line 1)

manābituhu miθlu (’a)s sadūsi wa lawnuhu  
kaṣawki (’a)s saiyāli fahwa ’aḡbun *yafīšu* (line 5)

In the first line *tabūšu* and *tanūšu* are from *bāša* and *nāša* respectively, with ta- = you

masc. sg. They are *aḏḏād*, i.e. *expressing two contradictory meanings* (see §2.2.47 above): *bā-ša* = move forward, advance; *nā-ša* = move backward, regress<sup>224</sup>. Both are based on PHS \*-ḏ- “move” (§2.10.25 above), and for the interchange of /ḏ/ and /š/, see §2.12.1, n. 4a & 4b above. It seems that there was at first a proot [ḏaW] expressing a highly abstract semantic notion “move”, and that the addition of grammatical affixes or other proots to this proot makes possible the derivation of many trilaterals, with each serving only to *define the “move” in terms of place, direction, quality, or time*. Its meaning is still general, though not as general as that of the [ḏaW], hence [mḏ] “depart, go away, pass away”, [wḏ] “travel, go out”, and with negative /n-/ [nd] “come back”, etc. (see §2.10.25 above). Later, the addition of affixes to any of such trilaterals derives words expressing various shades of meaning as in all Semitic languages. This is, in brief, the whole story of HS root system, and its historical development through stages.

In returning to our main topic, we find that Imri’ Al Qais described Salma’s teeth as being white and clean (line 4) and their color like that of a plant, called *saiyāl*, bearing white thorns (resembling teeth). Such *white thorns* are described as being *sweet and yaḏḏu*. The precise meaning of *yaḏḏu* is not agreed upon by old Arab scholars. Some, like Aṣma’i, do not know the meaning, for some others it denotes ‘go away’, others ‘speak’, and still others ‘glitter’ (LA). The last meaning has been widely adopted, while the two others are, in my opinion, far removed from the text. The word is a compound of \*fa’- + \*-š- “to glitter; shine” (rather than \*-š- “sound, speaking”), as a matter of fact, /ḏ ~š/ = “shine; speak”.

**2.17.69** Egyp. ḥb “honey plant” (EHD I, 539) is a compound of ḥ’ “flowering plant” (EHD I, 527) and \*bW “a bee, honey” (see §2.17.39 above). Based on the Egyp form, we may assume that CA ḥawwu *arch.* “honey” is from \*ḥawbu, where /-b-/ was subject to regressive assim.

**2.17.70** BHeb. ḥāpaz “to leap or start up, rise up suddenly; haste” (OT, 334), CA ḥafaza “to give impetus to a person/animal to move forward, urge to move forward, goad”; ḥafzu “haste”; muḥtafiza “getting ready to jump, about to jump”; iḥtafaza “prepare oneself to jump”.

The trilateral is most certainly a compound of two quite obvious elements, of which the 2<sup>nd</sup> element is [paz-] as in CA fazza “to jump, leap” (see §2.3.16 above). This is also the same element seen in [ʔpaz] (cf. 2.3.16 above), [ḳpaz] (cf. §2.17.83.4), [ḡfz], etc. id.

As for the 1<sup>st</sup> element /ḥa-/, there are only two possibilities:

a) The word ḥpaz is a blend of [ḥaθ-] as in CA ḥaḥa “to urge” plus [paz-], with /-θ-/ being assimilated completely to the following /-p-/. The sequences [ḥθpaz] and [ḥθz] are, as a matter of fact, impossible to pronounce and for this obvious reason do not exist.

b) I don’t know whether this /ḥa-/ is the same as /ḥa-/ in [ḥkr]: see §2.17.77, n. 1 below.

<sup>224</sup> It appears that [bā-] and [nā-] are added to [-ša] to express “(straight) forward” and “backward, aside” respectively.

**2.17.71** CA *ḡamūsu* [r. *ḡms*] may render “a she-camel carrying a fetus”, but lit. *a child in her belly*, Eth.: Te. ‘amasä-t “be bregnant”, Har. mūs “pregnant” (HED, 112), Chad.: Bidiya, Migama miča “son, child” (HSED, n. 1769). The CA word may not be a compound of \*ḡw- “bottom, inside, down”, therefore ‘covered’, ‘unseen’, ‘hidden’, and \*musu “child”. It is most likely cognate with Egyp. phrase Egyp. ‘ *ms* “first born” (EHD I, 107), where ‘ “(great) one, chief” and *ms* “child”.

Other cognates are Ug. mθ “child” (UG, 531), Egyp. *ms* “child, son”; *msmsw* pl.; *msw nbw* “mankind”, i.e. *all who are born* (*nbw* = all), Copt. *mes* “child”, Egyp. *ms* also signifies “an amulet worn by women to obtain easy labor”; *msi* “to give birth”; *mssθ* “birth”, *mss-t* “a woman who brings forth, something which is born or produced, birth”.

**2.17.72** Egyp. *mḥwt* “offerings”<sup>225</sup> = CA *māḥa* “to give, to bestow, to offer, grant (for free and out of generosity)”; *maiḥu* “benefit” also “grace”.

1) It is amazing to find that the same notion can also be expressed by [*mnh*] as in Phoen. *mnh̄t* “offering” (Harris, PG, 120), Ug. *mnh* id. also “tribute” (UG, 534, 536), CA *manaḥa* “to grant, bestow upon”; *minḥa-tu* “offering, grant”, from *someone who is superior*, nowadays, *from an institution or government* = Egyp. *mnh̄ity* “a king’s gift”; *mnh̄w* “to sacrifice, to offer up an animal” ~ *mnh* “to award, to confer a gift or honor; to be good, to be gracious”; *mnh* “an offering” (EHD I, 304), BHeb. \**mānaḥ* obsol., preserved in *minḥā* “gift, present; an offering to God, a sacrifice”, BAram. *minḥā* id. (OT, 588), Hatra *mnh* id. (NWSI II, 658).

2) The same sort of meaning can also be expressed without proot /-ḥ/ as in Sab. *mn* “benefit” (SD, 86) = CA *minna-tu* “benefit, gift” also “grace, kindness”; *manna* “to grant, bestow” (usu. *God or a superior*) = Egyp. *mn* “to offer” (EHD I, 301), BHeb. *mn* “gift” as in the compound *אחיו-מן* “brother of a gift”.

All words above are from a compound whose first element is [*ma-*] “hand”, hence also “to grasp” as in Egyp. *m* “to grasp” (EHD I, 266). It is most likely that \*-n is a prep. signifying “to”.

3) Egyp. *mḥ* “cubit” (EHD I, 316) = CA *māḥa-tu* “a kind of measure”, most likely *a fathom* as in *Hadith* «*nazalnā fīḥā sittatan māḥatan*», *We went down into it* (it, i.e. *-ḥā* of *fīḥā*, refers back to *a well*) *six fathoms* (ṢḤḤ I, 408; LA). Egyp.-CA cognates are based on *ma-* “hand” and \*-ḥ perh. “stretching”.

4) CA *māḥa* also expresses “(the sun) heat making one sweat” as in Poet.:

«’iḏā (’i)*mtāḥa* ḥarru (’a)š šamsi ḏifrāhu...» (LA).

The CA word is from \*-ḥ- “sun” (see §2.13.24, esp. n. 4 above).

**2.17.73** Egyp. *nḥḥ* “eternity” (EG, 575) is from an earlier *nwhḥ* “eternity” (EHD I, 383, 355), a compound of *nw* “city, settlement, town, village” (EHD I, 351) and *ḥḥ* “eternity” (EHD I, 507), and the orig. meaning was “*town/city of eternity*”.

<sup>225</sup> Egyp. *m’* “to give, to present, offer”; *m’w* “gifts” may not be due to the interchange of /ḥ/ and its voiced counterpart /ḥ̣/.

**2.17.74** Pun. ḥrdh "terror, awe" (NWSI I, 403), BHeb. ḥārad "to tremble"; ḥarādāh "trembling, terror, fear" (OT, 342-343), CA ḥarida "to be angry"; ḥaradu "anger". In Sab. ḥrd "land reserved by a deity" (SD, 70) developed from "separate from" as in CA ḥarada "separate oneself from, withdraw from, be alone"; ḥarīdu "alone" = waḥīdu id. (from wāḥīdu "one": see §2.12.18 above) = farīdu id. (from fardu "single, individual, one" = Sab. frd-m "uniquely, alone": cf. Beeston, SD, 46) = CA farad-n.

ḥidda-tu "fury, anger"; bi ḥidda-h "angrily, sharply"; CVIII 'iḥtadda "become angry". For notions as 'separate from' and 'land reserved by a deity': cf. CA ḥadd "boundary, border, edge; bounds".

**2.17.75** CA salaba "to rob, carry off, plunder"; salbu "theft, booty", but in OSA s<sup>3</sup>lb "to carry off, abduct" (Stehle, JAOS, 60, p. 526), while in Sab. s<sup>3</sup>lb "to draw water improperly, i.e. *steal or plunder water*" (SD, 138). Both words share in common a stem [sal] "to plunder, rub, steal" (see §2.8.19 above) and differ with regard to the second element of the compound. The element in Sab. is clearly [ʿab] "water" (§2.2.22 above), while in CA is unclear. It cannot, however, be a blend of [sal] and [sab-] as in CA sabā "to capture women as prisoners in wars"; sabyu "spoils; captives (understood only as *women*)"<sup>226</sup>, since [slb] has nothing to do with *women*. The triliteral, like that of Sab., was a complete sentence, and it will be re-examined below in §2.17.76 below.

**2.17.76** BHeb. šālap "to draw out, pluck out", e.g. *a weapon from a wound* (Job. 20, 25), *a sword from its sheath, to draw a sword* (Num. 22, 23. 31.), *to pull or pluck up*, e.g. *grass* (Ps 129, 6), *to draw or pull off one's shoe* (Ruth 4, 7. 8.: cf. OT, 1065). All such meanings, except the last, are expressed in CA by CVIII 'istalla of [sll] = BHeb. šll (see below), some of them, esp. *the first and second meanings*, may also be expressed by CI salla, but never by salaba. The last meaning is expressed by šalaḥa "take off (i.e. throw away) one's shoes, clothes, etc." (= BHeb. šlh "to send forth, cast, throw", Mand. šlh "to take off, cast off, undress", etc.) or ḥala'a, etc. Here also belong Akk. šalāpu, Aram., Syr., Mand. šlp, BAram. šlp "to draw out, pluck out" (MD, 469).

a) The supposed CA and Eth. cognate cited by Semitists is *salaba* as in Ge. sālābā, Tna., Ed., S., W. "to castrate", Har. sālāba id.; sulub "eunuch" (HED, 139), CA salaba "rob of, deprive of, etc." (§2.17.75 above). Akk.-Hebr.-Aram. šlp and CA-Eth. šlb are false cognates, though they share the underlying biliteral \*šal-. The signification of the Eth. triliteral may suggest that final \*-b could be a proot for "people" [slb, sby] since a "eunuch" is historically a captive treated as a slave. Accordingly, CA *salaba* in §2.17.75 above is a compound of a stem šal- and a proot \*baW "people, human being or *souls*" as in Egyp. b, bw "people" (EHD I, 197). A very close derivative is Eyp. b' "might, strength" and CA ba'-wu, etc. see §2.1.6.5.5, n. 3f under *Comments* above.

On the other hand, CA *salafa* and *salaba* share in common [sal] "to plunder, steal" also "to draw or pull out", etc. see §2.8.19 above, but with two different applications; *salafa* applies to 'a piece of land' and signifies 'to reform' in the sense *to rid it of* (pull

<sup>226</sup> OffAram. šby "to capture, make captive"; coll., šby, Samal. šby "captives, prisoners", Syr., Mand. šby, Heb. šbh, Sab. s'by "to capture; prisoner": Akk. šābū "enemy" (NWSI, II, 1100-1101; MD, 446).

out) *stone, weeds, and rising and falling ground* (make it *even, level*), hence = Sab s<sup>l</sup>lf “leveled ground, platform” (SD, 126).

**2.17.77** CA ribḥu “profit or gain from commerce”, rabiḥa “to gain, to profit”, Tham. rbḥ “to gain, profit” (Branden, 1950: 518), Sab. rbḥ “profit, interest”; h-rbḥ caus. “make a profit” (Beeston, SD, 114). The triliteral is based on [rab] “increase, grow” as in Akk. rabū id. (AG, 97), BHeb. rbb “become much, many, multiply”, rbh “become much, many, to increase” (OT, 957-958), etc. gen. Sem. The second element \*ḥau- (or \*ḥaw-) “profit”, ḥw “plenty, surplus” as in Egyp. ḥ “profit”; ḥw “plenty, surplus” (EHD I, 453). Egyp. ḥw = ḥ “expanding, stretching, etc.”, the one I had discovered in HS many years before the analysis of this triliteral.

1) Another ḥ- is seen in EHeb. [ḥkr] “to rent”, OffAram. \*ḥkr “rent” (NWSI I, 371): CA ḥakara, CVIII ’iḥtakara “to collect articles of trade or commodities (esp. *food*) and withhold them (i.e. don’t sell them) until the price rises”, in MSA “to monopolize, withhold a commodity; ground-rent, etc.). A natural question rises here, *is [ḥ-] different from or the same as [-ḥ] above?*

There is no doubt that the triliteral is a compound of two elements \*ḥa- and [kar-], and that while the signification of [kar] is evident, i.e. ‘*rent, buy*’ (see §2.2.14 above), the signification or function of \*ḥ- is to some extent ambiguous. Intuitively speaking, the origin of \*ḥa- may *not* lie in CA ḥawā “to collect, gather”; CVIII ’ḥtawā “to contain, include, possess”.

It is possible that /ḥ/ shares with /g/ of CA [ḡkr] the same ultimate origin (see §2.17.83.10 below). What was the phonetic nature of that original sound, frankly, I have no way of knowing. The only thing I know for sure, however, is that /ḥa-/ is *unquestionably* a proot since I can give numerous traditional roots to prove it. One of such examples is ḥarkala-tu fem. “(men) on foot, foot soldiers”: see *first* §2.25, n. 5 below and *then* §2.17.2, n. 3 above.

**2.17.78** CA ṯa’aḡa “to bleat (an ewe)” is from a compound of [ṯa’] “ewe” (§2.13.10, n. b above) and \*ga(W)- “voice, sound, noise” (§§2.11.55-3.11.58 above). BHeb. šā’ag “to roar” (OT, 1022) may be cognate or from caus. ša- plus [ga(W)]. If we assume that CA is from caus. [ša-] in this triliteral, we will end up with an inevitable conclusion that caus. [ša-], caus. [da- ~ ta-], phonemes /θ, s, š, etc./ go back to one single sound. This is impossible to prove and is a waste of time to think of it.

**2.17.79** CA samala “to gouge or scoop another’s eye”. Verb *samara* also expresses “to gouge or scoop another’s eye”. The two words differ in the *instrument* used in the action: for *samala*, it is ‘*a thorn*’ and for *samara* is a ‘*piece of iron, as a nail*’. It is evident that *samara* is derived from mi-smār “nail”: Phoen. smr “to nail”, Samal smr “nail”, BHeb. masēmēr<sup>227</sup> “nail”, BAram. smr “to fast with nail” (NWSI II, 793; OT, 727).

1) The verb *samala* is a compound of stems [sam-] and [’al-]. The first stem is seen in

---

<sup>227</sup> The inst. /mi-/ has become a part of the root in modern dialects of Arabic, hence *masmar* “to nail”.

Akk. *samū* “blind”, Mand. *smy* “be blind, lose sight” (MD, 332), CA *\*samaha* “blind”, found in the following expression, which includes three synonymous words: *sumaihā*, *‘umaihā*, *kumaihā* = *blindly* as in this old expression: «*ḡahaba-t ‘ibluhu (‘a)s sumaihā, wa (‘a)l ‘umaihā wa (‘a)l kumaihā*», *his camels have gone blindly in all directions*; *sāmiḥu* “perplexed” (see n. 3 below). The second stem is in CA *mi-’allu* “horn having an acute or sharp point suitable of piercing”; *’alla-tu* “spear-head”.

2) CA expression above shows clearly two facts:

2a) HS had a proot *\*hā* occurring as part of the root in some trilaterals, e.g. CA *kumaihā* above, as a suffix in some other cases, e.g. *‘umai-hā* above, and as a suffix that can be dropped or kept, e.g. CA [km] or [kmh] “blind” below.

2b) CA *sam* ~ *kam* above suggests a pre-historic relationship between /s/ and /k/. The question rises here: *is /s/ above from an earlier /θ/, from a cluster /sk/, or from a consonant different from either?*

3) Akk. *kamū* also expresses “blind” and so do CA *kamā* and *kamma id.* Another related trilateral expressing the same idea is *’a-kmahu* [kmh] “one who is blind by birth” as in the Koran (3: 49): (وَأَبْرَأُ الْأَكْمَه); *’akmaha* “be blind by birth”; *kamahu* “blindness by birth”; *kamiha-t*, said of the sun, “become dark, i.e. *blind*” = OffAram. *’km* “to become blind” (NWSI I, 52). For roots beginning with [kam], see §2.1.9.5, n. 2 above.

Another trilateral based on [kam] is [tkm] as in *tukma-tu*, said of a blind, “walking without a guide” (Al ‘Ayn V, 343). The very same stem [km] is also seen in *’a-bkamu* “one who is unable to speak, mute”, n. *bukmu* (§2.13.11 above).

**2.17.80** BHeb. סלעם (*sal’ām*) “locust”, i.e. *one which swallows*: BAram. *sl’m* “to swallow down, to consume” (OT, 726) are from a compound of caus. *s-* + stem [*’am*] “eat” as in CA CII *\*sa’-am-* = “to feed, to nourish” (cf. CA *s’m*, Egyp. *s-’m* “eat”: see §2.2.56.1 above) > Heb-Aram. *sl’m* by dissimilation, i.e. *the first /’/ of sa’-ama dissimilates to /-l-/. A similar quadrilateral is CA sal’afa ~ salyafa* “to swallow”, which is ultimately from stem *ṣaf-* (see §2.17.49, esp. n. d above).

As a matter of fact, dissimilation is responsible for huge numbers of roots in Semitic languages, especially in CA. To say the truth, the numbers are indeed so much larger than one may expect. A few examples are:

i) CA *ḡa’-aba* “to kill” → with the first /’/ dissimilating to /l/, giving rise to a new quadrilateral *ḡal’aba id.*;

ii) Assy. *\*hmt*: cf. CA CII *hammaṭa* “to subdue, subjugate by force” → Assy. *harmaṭu* “to destroy” (Note that in both Assy. and CA the trilateral [hmt] has also to do with “burning”: in Assy. “to burn” and in CA “to roast”: cf. King, 1898: 348). The trilateral is from primeval proot seen in Egyp. *ḥaw* (or *ḥaw*) “sun”, later “fire” > “burn”; *ḥm-t* “fire, heat” (EHD I, 538, 547). For its Sem. cognates, see §2.2.38 above.

iii) BHeb. *\*ḡddm*: cf. CA *ḡaddumu* “axe” (Cush.: Ag., Bil. *ḡdub*, Som. *gudum- id.*: cf. VPHS, 126) → BHeb. *ḡardōm* “axe”, Syr. *ḡrdm*, *ḡardun*, Targ. *ḡardūn id.*;

iv) Har. *ḡirādāda* “to cut into small pieces, chop”, Tna. *ḡārdādā*, Amh. *ḡārāddādā*, Te. *ḡārdādā* (HED, 129): CA *ḡaddada* “to cut lengthwise from top to bottom”. Also, Har. *ḡādāda*, etc. gen. Eth. “to tear, cut through”;

v) Aram. *\*shb*: cf. CA *sahaba* “to hasten”, CII caus. *sahhaba* → Aram. *sarhēb* “to

hasten”;

vi) CA ġamada “be hard, icy, frozen”, CII caus. ġammada → \*ġammūdu → ġalmūdu “rock”, BHeb. galmūd “hard”;

vii) CA subbulatu “ear of corn”, BHeb. šibbōlet id. → CA sunbulatu id. Note that one can neither say \*surbulatu nor \*sulbulatu);

vii) CA ẓammaša “to gather; to eat from here and there; bad (of anything)” → karmaša expresses the same meanings; CA ẓammaša = SL (and other dialects) la’māš “eat from here and there, a bit from here and another from there”, from li’mī (CA luḡma-tu) “a bit of food”

viii) Aram. ʿṭl “be naked”, CA ʿaṭila, said of a woman, “be destitute (naked) of ornaments, like necklaces, earrings, bracelets & the like” → Aram. ʿarṭēl id.;

ix) Aram. šhb “to shine”, BHeb. šhb “to glitter, shine, as gold”, CA šhb “to glitter” → Aram. šlhb “be bright, aflame”;

It is interesting to note that CA has the quadriliteral šlhb ~ slhb and it signifies “tall”, formed from šayhabu id. (also shb “lengthen”, etc.). *Is there any ultimate relationship between /šhb/ and Sem. /ḏhb/ “gold”?*

x) OAram krs’y, Phoen. krsy “throne” (NWSI I, 536-537), CA kursiy “a chair, throne” ← is from a form \*kuss- as in Akk. kussū/kussī- “throne”, generally regarded as borrowed from Sumerian (NWSI I, 522), Ug. ksu id. (UG, 536), etc. It is to be noted, however, that final -y could be identical with that of CA dūriy “sparrow”, from dūru pl. of dāru “house”, so-called because it lives in the house, i.e. *belongs to the house*. Accordingly, the word is based on [ks] “clothing, garment” (cf. CA kisā’ id.) plus -y “belonging to, made from” and is thus purely HS. For the *ultimate origin* of this native PHS compound [kus], see §§2.17.83.13 & 2.17.83.26 below. A subchapter dealing with ‘borrowing’ is in §2.25 below;

xi) CA ṭms “darkness, dark” → ṭlms, ṭrms (~ ṭrmš) “very dark” (see n. xiv below);

xii) CA ḥṭm “nose of an animal” → ḥrṭm “trunk of an elephant” also “nose of some wild animals”;

xiii) CA ṭhm “beautiful” → ṭrhm id. By adding /-l/ to [ṭhm], we get a quadriliteral [ṭhml] in ṭahmalu “ugly”;

xiv) CA ṭsm “dark(ness)” (from ṭms, by metathesis) → ṭrsm (~ ṭršm), ṭlsm id.: see n. xi above;

xiv) CA ġ’m “old insane woman, aged she-camel, reckless and crazy (fem.)” → ġl’m “aged she camel” also “insolent (fem)”;

xv) CA fd’ “deviating foot” → fld’ id.;

xvi) CA fḵ’ “to snap (fingers), crack” → frḵ’ id.;

xvii) CA šl’ “baldhead”: CII šalla’a lit. “make one’s head bald” → šlf’, šlm’ “shave one’s head”.

xviii) CA saġġa’a “to speak or write in rhymed prose” = Eth. zange’a id.

xix) BHeb. gibbor “man” = Syr. ganburā id.

xx) CA mukabbalu, BHeb. məkubbāl “girded” = BHeb. mukurbal id.

xxi) BHeb. kussemet pl. “a species of grain like wheat” → CA kirsana-tu pl. id., SL karsanneh id., used only as ‘fodder for animals’.

xxii) CA bi-ġiddān ~ bi-ġiddā’ = bi-ġildān ~ bi-ġildā’ < bi-ġidd = “clear(ly)” (LA,

ġdd, ġld).

xxiii) Heb. bķķ "to pour out, to empty" ~ blķ "to empty out, make empty", CA balaķa, 'ablaķa "to open up (a door), make wide open". SL baķķ "to throw out, *as water from the mouth*" the opposite of maķķ;

xxiv) CA hamma'a "to hasten, to shed (tear)"; harma'a-tu ~ halma'a-tu "quickness" < hama'a "to flow, to shed tears";

xxv) Assyr. bakkatu = balkatu "to tear down". Similarly, CA fķ "expand" → flķ "make broad", ħšm "nose" → hršm "the overlooking part (like a nose) of a mountain"; ħbš "to scratch" → hrbš id.; BHeb. z'p "be angry", Syr. z'p "be burned" → BHeb. zl'p "to glow, be hot"; Amh. dambara for dabbara "to speak"; Aram. rurbā "dignitary" from [rbb] "be great". For additional evidence on dissimilation<sup>228</sup>, see O'Leary, 1969: §§31-36.

Hundreds of such examples can be cited. The passive with /-n-/ of such quadrilaterals inserts -n- in CA after the second radical as in 'ifranķa'a, 'iħranġama, etc.

3) In some rare cases the derived quadrilateral survives and the trilateral disappears as in CA farkaķa-tu "with parted hips" is formed from \*fkķ, preserved in SL fakaķ, said of the ankle, "be twisted" and farkūķ "with twisted ankles, lame, unskillful".

The surface structure of trilateral [fkķ] may be deceptive since it suggests that the trilateral is a compound of \*pak- and \*kūķ- or \*kū'-. The first part of the compound is seen in CA fakka "to disjoin, separate, unbutton, unbind", Egyp. pk "to separate", etc. As for the second part, it is seen in Egyp. ķ'ķ "elbow", CA kū'u id. To know why I refer to surface structure as deceptive, see CA faġ- and faķaġ- (< \*faġaķ because of seq. const.) in §2.11.28 above.

**2.17.81** Phoen. šp' "serpent", BHeb. šepa' "a viper" (PG, 141; OT, 903), etc., a blend of \*šw- "sound; hissing" and \*pa'- "viper" (see §2.3.25 above).

**2.17.82** As has been shown in §2.17.1, n. 6 above, trilaterals beginning with [naw-] express "sway, etc.". One obvious exception is [nwm] "to sleep" as in Akk. munāttu, pl. munāmāttu "slumber in the morning" (= CA ma-nāmā-tu pl. "dream"; sg. manāmu), CA nāma "to sleep", Eth. nōma "to sleep", Syr. nām "to be in deep slumber", Heb. nām Poet. "to sleep" (Rabin, 1975: 92, n. 77). It is also seen in Hamitic language divisions as in Egyp. nm "to sleep, to slumber" (EHD I, 375), nm' "to sleep" (EHD I, 375). The trilateral is impossible to be from a proot \*nm or from \*Wm. It could be, as a guess, from either \*ny- "to rest" or from proot [naw]. The real meaning of \*naw- can be

<sup>228</sup> When progressive assimilation (as in Aden Arabic below) can take place after dissimilation, it will be a very difficult task to reconstruct the original medial radical without comparative evidence. For example, Har. ķarrāķa "lighter (for cigarettes)", Te. ķarķa "take fire" are from Arabic (Aden) ķarrāķ (HED, 129). The development of Aden Arabic form is as follows: ķaddāķ > ķardāķ > ķarrāķ = SL 'iddāķah fem. (from ķiddāķa-tu) "lighter (for cigarettes); 'ardaķa-t fem. (with the first /-d-/ dissimil. to /-r-/) + ma' 'with' "be very angry, i.e. *giving out sparks*): CA ķaddāķa-tu fem. "a piece of steel for striking sparks from flint; fire flint", as a vb ķadaķa "to strike fire with a flint", Heb. ķdķ "to burn", etc. Without evidence from SL it will be almost impossible to trace Eth. and Aden words to CA [ķdķ].



grasped from *looking at s.o. who is drowsy or at branches of trees swaying by the wind. You will see how he swings (his head, his body, etc.) sideways out of drowsiness.* You may substitute /-d/ for /-m/ and get a new trilateral [nwd]. The lexical meaning of *nawada* is “move back and forth one’s head”.

**2.17.83** Egy. [gí] “form, like, manner, character” also “act, condition” as in *gí wnm* “the act of eating”, *gí sw* “drinking”, *gí n sf* “the manner of yesterday” (for *sf*, see §2.17.14 above) *gí sgrḥ* “condition of peace”, [g’í], too, expresses “kind, manner, style of” (EHG II, 801, 804).

Similarly, Egy. [k’] expresses “form, manner”, [k’y] “state, condition, form, manner, image, aspect, style”, [ky] “form, manner, condition” as in *k’ wnmí* “food”, *k’ swry* “drink”, *k’y ḥnwtí* “the condition of working men” (EHD II, 761).

Likewise, Egy. [k’] denotes “character, disposition, image, person, disposition, double, etc.” (EHD II, 782).

All such proots had first been used as separate words to modify the meaning of the following *nouns* and form together with them nominal phrases expressing a particular shade of meaning as the above-cited examples demonstrate; this stage may be called ‘*the 1<sup>st</sup> HS stage*’, later the nominal phrases became autonomous roots in some of their occurrences in Egypt, but in all of their occurrences in sister languages; this stage may be called ‘*the 2<sup>nd</sup> HS stage*’.

For what concerns CA, the roots under study are often easy to separate from words in many of their occurrences and, as has been just mentioned above, the original nominal phrase has become a root, which can be derived into verbs, nouns, and adjectives. For example, *mu-karkasu* [krks] adj. “fettered”; *karkasa-tu* fem. n. “a person so walking”, but without a vb signifying “to fetter, tie”. This quadrilateral has preserved intact both PHS \*ka- and Sem. [rks], which is unfound in CA in the given order of radicals: see §2.1.6.9, *Comments* II above. Some illustrative examples from the *2<sup>nd</sup> HS stage* are:

**2.17.83.1** Egy. *g’ty-t* “a kind of bread” (EHD II, 804) is from a compound of [g’í] and [t’] “bread, loaf, cake” (EHD II, 817).

**2.17.83.2** Egy. *gíd’* “hand” (EHD II, 805) consists of *gí* plus *d’-t* “palm of the hand” (EHD II, 894).

**2.17.83.3** Egy. *gpywt* pl. “foot” (EHD II, 807): *p’d* “foot”.

**2.17.83.12** BHeb. *ḵpš Piel*. “to leap, spring”, BAram. *ḵpš id.* (OT, 933), Syr. *ḵwz*, Aram. *ḵpz id.* (Moscatti, 1969: §8.8), CA *ḵafaza* “to jump, i.e. *jump over a ditch, over a rope, off a wall, a roof, back of a horse, & the like*” ~ ḡafaza id., OYem. ḡafzu “walking fast” (LA).

**2.17.83.5** Egy. *ḵ’ys* “to tie, to fetter”; *ḵ’ss-t* “fetter, bond”, *ḵ’s* “rope ladder”, with loss of a syllable /-’-/ , *ḵs* “to bind, tie, fetter” ~ *gs* (EHD II, 765, 778, 813), a compound of *ḵ’* and *yss* “to tie, fetter”; *yswt* pl., *yss-t* “rope, cord” (EHD I, 82).

**2.17.83.6** Egyp. ḳ’ḥ’ “light, fire” (EHD II, 764): ḳ’ḥ’ “luminary, the sun, light-giver”, a combination of ḳ’ and ḥ’i-t “light, radiance” (EHD I, 459).

**2.17.83.7** Egyp. ḳ’d “fire, heat” (EHD II, 765): [ḳ’] above plus [d’] “fire, flame” (EHD II, 864).

**2.17.83.8** Egyp. ḳhb “to butt with the horns” (EHD II, 777) shows the loss of /-’-/: [ḳ’] above plus stem [hb] “to butt with the horns” (EHD I, 445).

**2.17.84.9** Egyp. k’ṯ’b “pot, vessel, vase” (EHD II, 791): k’ plus ṯ’b “pot, vessel, cup” (EHD II, 850).

**2.17.83.10** CA CIV ’aḡkara “to sell by pressing solicitation” or “to seek to sell by persuasion” also “insist, etc.”. For kara, see §2.2.14 above.

**2.17.83.11** CA ḡamašu “to flirt with a woman, i.e. *say sweet words to her, pinch her gently, play with her*” is a combination of \*ga- “manner or style of” and [maš ~ mas < maṯ] “touch”.

**2.17.83.12** CA kasa’ “end (e.g. *of a month*), posterior part”, in an old idiom: «*rakiba kus’a-hu*» “fall on *the back*”: rakiba is the gen. Sem. term for “ride”, i.e. *be atop of*, kus’- “back” (see §2.1.6.9, *Comments* II), -hu “his”.

**2.17.83.13** Egyp. k’ṯ’ty “a cloth made of linen or wool or hair, garment, covering” (EHD II, 791), Ug. kst ~ mks “clothing” (UG, 532), Phoen. ksy, OffAram., DA ksy “to cover, be clothed”, Hatra ksy “a cover”, JAram. kswt “clothing” (NWSI I, 523), BHeb. kāsūt “a covering”: kāsā “to cover”, BAram. kāsā “to cover; hide” (OT, 479), CA kusā’, kisā’ “garment, clothing, covering”; coll. fem. kuswa-tu ~ kiswa-tu; kasā “to put on, provide with clothes, to cover with cloth”, Sab. ks’ “garment” (SD, 79).

It may be well here to start the discussion with Semitic. The Semitic trilateral [ksw] is a compound of two elements: \*k- and \*suw-. The 2<sup>nd</sup> element of the compound is seen in BHeb. סוּת sūt “garment, clothing”, *customary regarded by some scholars as being form kāsūt whose first unstressed syllable was dropped* (OT, 718). Neither BHeb. nor its sister languages furnish evidence supporting this point of view. PSem. had a root [sw] denoting “cloth, clothing”, and this Proto-root is also seen in combinations with other prefixes, e.g. /m-/ as in Pun. *mswyh* “clothing” (NWSI II, 663) and BHeb. *mswt* “veil”.

PSem. [sw] is cognate with Egyp. -ṯ’, and the original proot is seen in CA ṯuwwā-tu “a piece of cloth or of wool”, with b-ext. ṯawbu “garment, clothing”. An arch. pl. form of this word is ’aṯ’ubu. It seems that pl. forms of a CA word, esp. *very rare ones*, provide valuable information about the morphological structure of the word<sup>229</sup>.

<sup>229</sup> Some rarely used or heard of pl. forms (i.e. *arch.*) are ’ad’uru “houses”, the commonly used plurals are dūru, diyāru (gen. Sem. dwr “house, wall”), ’as’uḳu “leg”, the commonly used pl. is sīḳā-nu (gen. Sem. šwḳ “leg”, in Egyp. sbḳ. This suggest that Egyp. did not change /-w-/ into a

For PSem. [siw] or [suw], also see §2.17.83.26 below.

**2.17.83.14** CA *kadḏa* “overcrowd, thong”; CVIII *’iktaḏḏa* “be crowded or overcrowded with (e.g. *people*)”: *’adḏa* (see §2.1.6.5.21 above).

**2.17.83.15** *kušša-tu* “lock of hair, forelock”, SL *kaššiš* “woman’s lock of hair”: *šūšī-tā* (*tā* is from *t-* *fem. marker* + *hā* = *her*) “her forelock or lock of hair”: Egyp. *šw* “hair” (*šš* “white hair”, *sš* “hair, lock, tress”, etc. cf. EHD II, 621, 633, 645).

**2.17.83.16** CA *ḡu’na-tu* “a kind of round basket” (see §2.3.37, n. 4 above).

**2.17.83.17** CA *ḡa’ūbu* “one who drinks excessively”; n. *ḡa’bu*; *ḡa’aba* “drink”; CIV *’aḡ’ba*: [’ab] “water” (§2.2.22 above).

**2.17.83.18** CA *kūbu* “cup”, pl. *’akwābu*, Egyp. *yb* “vase”, *yp-t* “vessel, vase”, *by-t* “drinking vessel”, *p’* “cup”.

**2.17.83.19** CA *ḡa’bu* (\**ḡu’bu*), *ḡu’būlu* (see §2.1.6.6, n. 4 above) is based on [-b- ~ -p-] “cup” (see §2.17.83.18 above).

**2.17.83.20** CA *ḡarmu*, *ḡirmilu* (see §3.1.6.6, n. 8a above) is a compound of proot [ḡ-] above, infixed -r-, and proot \*[-m] “man, male” (§2.17.61 above)<sup>230</sup>.

**2.17.83.21** BAram. *ḡḥn* “to incline, bend”, BHeb. *ḡāḥōn* “the belly of reptiles”, so called from its *bent or curved form* (OT, 189): PHS proot [g-] plus stem [ḡan] “incline, bend” as in CA *ḡanā id.* (see §2.2.51 above).

**2.17.83.22** CA CI *ḡaḡama* of rare use, CIV *’aḡḡama* and CVIII *’iḡtaḡama* are only in common use “throw *oneself* into (trouble, fight, etc.) carelessly or without prior thinking of the consequences”; *ḡuḡmu* coll. “death”: SL CI *’aḡam id.*, but the deep meaning is ‘*self* or *an interior force* entices or pushes one to do s.t.’, in a neg. sentence ‘(e.g. woman) does not appeal to + *self*’. For the story of this trilateral, see §2.12.23 above.

**2.17.83.23** CA *’iḡša’arra* [ḡš’r] is based on *ša’ara* “to feel”.

---

long vowel in pronunciation as Sem. *did*: CA *sāḡu*, BHeb. *šōḡ*, BAram. *šāḡ*. A similar example is CA *ḡabaka* ~ *ḡāka* (\**ḡawaka*, n. *ḡawku*) “weave”. So, CA *sāḡu* should have been pronounced \**suwūḡu* or \**sawaḡu*: dim. *suwaiḡu*. The term can apply to a tree and signify “root”, *arch.* pl. *suwūḡu* ~ *suwḡu* ~ *su’ūḡu* ~ *’as’uḡu*.

It is to this stem belongs CA *sabaḡa* “to overrun, go before, surpass” also “leave behind”, Egyp. *sbḡ* “to travel, journey”, OffAram., Nab., JAram, Hatra *šbḡ* “to leave, leave behind”. A trace of the earlier meaning of [ḡbḡ] has been preserved in CA *sabaḡa* “fetter the legs of a bird”.

<sup>230</sup> The very same proot is also found in *ḡammā’u* “figure of a person”.

**2.17.83.24** SL, Leb, etc. *miġĥāf* inst. “a manual tool used to remove (grease, paint, dirt, etc.) by pushing its hard edge along the surface”, but the vb is *ħaff*: CA *ġaħafa* “to peel, pare, skin”.

On the other hand, CA CIV *’aġħfa* + *by somebody* “draw near, come close to” is from *ħaffa* “touch” + *with* or *by somebody*.

**2.17.83.25** SL, Leb, etc. *žufiṣ* “rough, harsh”. *Is* /-ṣ/ *from an earlier* /-s/? For the interchange of /s/ & /ṣ/, see §2.2.48 below. To my understanding, however, the word is a compound of [žu] (from CA *ġu-*) + *fidd* “rough, harsh”. CA [ġfd] is common in adj. *muġfa’iddu* and vb *’iġfa’adda*, said of a dead body, “be swollen out”, i.e. *become/be huge, bulky* (in body)<sup>231</sup>.

**2.17.83.26** CA *kiswa-tu* fem. “dress, clothes, clothing”; *kisā’u* “garment, dress” as a vb *kasā* “to put on (clothes), cover”, Ug. kst “clothing”, mks id. (UG, 532), BHeb. *kəsūt* “a garment, covering, cover”, Sab. *ks’w* “garment” with *ks’wy* “military clothing” (SD, 79)<sup>232</sup>, JAram. *kswt* “clothing”, Hatra *ksy* “a cover”, Phoen., OffAram. *ksy* “to cover”, Pun. mks’ “covering” (NWSI I, 522-523, II, 625), etc.: see §2.17.83.13 above. The same proot is seen with or without infixed /-r-/ in all Semitic languages as in CA *kursī* “throne, chair”, Akk. *kussū* “throne, seat”; *kasū* “cover”, etc. see §2.17.83.13 above.

**2.17.83.27** Sab. *kbr* “abundance of crops” includes a proot [k-] and a stem *bur* “crops” (§2.14.2 above).

**2.17.83.28** Akk. *gugallu* “inspector, director” as in *gwgl nhr klm* “inspectors of all the water courses”, conjectured to be borrowed from Sumarian (NWSI I, 217). SL *žawžal* “to select the best of, to filter”, CA [ġwl] as in CVIII *’iġtāla* “select, choose”. All are definitely from a stem [gal] “to see” as in CA *ta-ġallā* “look at, come to view, be seen”, Akk. *d-gl* “to see”, etc. see §2.1.6.5.9 above. As for Semitists’ claim that the word is from Sumerian, *forgive them for they do not know*.

**2.17.83.29** CA *ġanāḥ* “wing” also “side”; *ġannaḥa* “to incline toward (the side)”, said of a ship “be stranded”, Egyp. *ḏnḥ* “wing”: CA *nāḥiya-tu* “side”, pl. *nawāḥī* (§2.2.51 above).

**2.17.83.30** CA *ġafhu* ~ *ġamhu* “arrogance, insolence, haughtiness”: *fahfaha-tu* fem. “boasting vainly, ostentation, vainglory”. To this stem belong such roots as *fhr* “glory, glorious; boast in, be proud, etc.”, *fhm* “excellency, grand, greatness, etc.”, and so forth.

**2.17.83.31** Gen. Sem. *kpr* “village”, Egyp. *k’pr* id. All are from a compound of proot [ka’] and stem [par] as in Egyp. *pr* “house, seat of government”.

<sup>231</sup> It is important to keep in mind that CA *ġafisu* or *ġafisu* can also express this derived meaning as well as “rough, harsh, mean”.

<sup>232</sup> The same meaning, i.e. ‘military clothing’, is expressed in CA by *bizza-tu*.

**2.17.83.32** CA albu, the most widely used term for “heart”: CA and gen. HS lubbu “heart”.

## 2.18 The Definite Article

On the state of the definite article in Semitic and its origin, Wright (1966: 114-115) states:

*«Before quitting the demonstrative pronouns, I will say a few words regarding the definite article, which really belongs to this class of words. Its original form was, in all probability, ḥāl (hal), a compound of hā and l, nearly in the sense of the Latin ille... In Hebrew the l was assimilated to all following letters; and when the doubling wholly ceased to be audible, the loss of it was compensated by the lengthening of the vowel into ā...In Phoenician its form is the same as in Hebrew...The Arabs ordinarily weakened the initial ḥ /h/ to ḥ /ʕ/, but restricted to assimilation of the final /l/ to the following dental, sibilant or liquid (the so-called solar letters)...In Ethiopic there is no definite article, and the same appears to be the case in Assyrian. The Aramaic dialects... (use) suffixed ha- or ā, which appears in writing as an aleph /ʔ/».*

Identical views are expressed by other Semitists (cf. Moscati, 1969: §12.77, etc.). Brockelmann (1936: §177) expresses a similar view, but insists that *Proto-Semitic had no definite article, and that Ethiopic and Assyrian faithfully preserved this feature*. It will be demonstrated that Semitists' view on CA (ʔ)l, like their views on CA caus. /ʔ-/ (§2.3 above) or on any other linguistic feature, is simply groundless.

The real fact is that Proto-Semitic as well as Proto-Hamito-Semitic had a definite article /ʔal/, a demonstrative “*this* or *that*” in origin, and that the article, *like nearly everything else*, is preserved intact, *as anyone should expect*, only in CA as in *ʔal-yauma* (or *l yauma*) “this day, i.e. today” and *ʔal baitu* (or *l baitu*) “the house”. In other Semitic languages the article has either been reduced to /ʔa ~ ha(l)/, become part of the root, or been lost. There are still visible traces of this article in Semitic languages that testify to its previous existence.

1) One of such traces is Ug. *lrmn* “pomegranate” (UG, 535), Akk. *lurmu* id, but in CA *rummānu*, BHeb. *rimmōn*, Aram. *rmn* id. (OT, 982). A fundamental question arises here, *are the Akk-Ug. words and those of CA-Heb-Aram. cognates?* If they are, *how can we account for Akk.-Ug. initial /l-/?* And if they are not, *what is the origin of the Akk.-Ug. words?*

2) Ug. *ilḫṣ* “a kind of stone or gem” (UG, 536) has similarly preserved PHS \*[ʔl], and its cognate in CA is *ʔal ḫaddu* ~ *ʔal ḫadaḏu* “the + a kind of stone”, described as “a small stone” (Jamharah II, 1010; LA); *ḫidda-tu* ~ *ḫadda-tu* fem., said of the earth or land, “with much stones”. Some other examples are:

3) Akk. *elammakku* “a kind of precious wood” (AG, 72), BHeb. *ʔalmugg-īm*, pl., “almug-tree, “a kind of precious wood”, Talm. *ʔalmūg* “a kind of wood” (OT, 58), Ug.

almg “a kind of tree” (UG, 536): PHS stem mag- in CA ’al maġġu “the + a kind of plant”, and with /-m-/ becoming /-n-/ (for ease of pronunciation) and /’l/ becoming part of the root ’alanġaġu ~ yalanġaġu [lnġ] = “a kind of wood burns with a pleasant odor , incense”.

4) Ug. algbθ “a kind of precious stone” (UG, 535), Akk. algamiš- “pierre précieuse”, BHeb. ’elgābīš “grésil, cristaux de glace” (DRS I, 20), etc. are from a compound consisting of ’al- /’el- = CA ’al “the” and \*gbθ = CA ġībsu “congealed” also “plaster-stone”, also BHeb. gābīš “crystal de roche”, NHebr. gābūš “tas de pierre”; gābaš “entasser”, Aram.: Jp. gebaš “entasser”, Amh. gbäsābbäsä “entasser (la paille)” (DRS II, 97f). As has been mentioned, CA ġbs is from \*ġbθ, and the change is due to *seq. const.* The sequences \*ġbθ and \*ġmθ (see below) are not permitted in the language. The compound word is also seen in Egyp. yrḳ’b’s “a kind of stone” (EHD I, 73).

As for the Akk. word above, it is exact cognate has been preserved intact in SL (’a)l žamaš, coll., “the stone”, with žamaš coll., “stone” (sg. žamašē or žamašeh fem.), though not any kind of stone; *it is ‘a hard stone’ suitable for use in a fight*, CA: Or. ġumaš “résidu de pierres concassées”, Te. gomsa “paroi de rocher” (DRS III, 146).

5) The Arabic definite article is seen in a number of BHeb. words: comp. BHeb. ’alḳūm “people”: CA ’al ḳaumu “the people”; ḳaumu “people”, etc. (OT, 49, 60).

6) O’Leary (1969: §91) finds traces of /’al/ in BHeb. and Eth. He writes:

*«Hebrew perhaps retains traces of this article in such words as ’almōdād (Gen. x, 26), ’eltōlād (Joshua xv, 30 – tōlād in 1 Chron. iv, 29). We also find a reduplicated form in Abyssinian la-la > lali- with a pronominal suffix as lalika, denoting “that”. So in Arabic la-la- > ’al-la in compounds with δī, etc.*

For additional evidence from Akk., see §2.22, n. 5 below and from Sab., see §2.12.17 above.

7) Other HS demonstratives functioning as the definite article are: Egyp. pn, tn, nn “this” also “the” (EG: §112) and d’ “the” = Sem. dā “this”.

## 2.19 COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES

The HS adjective was inflected not only for *gender, number, and case*, but also for the *comparative and superlative*. The original comparative and superlative affixes became, exactly like nearly all other affixes, parts of the root. There is concrete evidence on two of such affixes: *comparative* [-(')r] and *superlative* [mu-]. The different methods of forming the comparative and superlative degrees in Semitic languages and Egyptian will be sketched in the course of our discussion below.

**2.19.1** Akk. mahrū “first; before”, Assy. mahrū “first, former; before, front, against” (Moscatti, 1969: §14.7; King, 1898: 360), SA mhr “stand facing something” = CA CVI tamh̄hara, said of camels, “to front the wind so as to sniff fresh air”; CX 'istamhara “stand in opposition to the wind (as when one urinates)”; māhira-tu “ship”, so-called, according to Ahmad Bin Yahya (in LA, r. mhr), because it “hits (= splits) the water with its front part as it sails”; CVIII 'imtahara “to choose out the best of (anything)”; muhra-tu, said of domestic animals, “the best”, etc. Gesenius (OT, 122f.) connects BHeb. bhr “to choose, select; choice, excellence”, with preposition min (= than) “be better” with CA [mhr]. All are from the root seen in CA hāra, CVIII 'ihtāra “to choose, select (usu. *‘the best’*)”; hīra-tu “the best of all”, Sab. hyr “nobleman” (SD, 64), Eth. hēr “good” (as a verb “to choose”), Akk. hāru “to select” (Rabin, 1975: 88, n. 34), Cush.: Bed. haruw “to search for, wish, want”; array “to choose”, arāw “to love”, Berb. iri “to love, want, wish” (VPHS, 109, n. 160), etc. see n (2) below. Besides, CA hāra (between any two thing) “to prefer one over another”, i.e. “one is better than another”; hiyāru “the best of”. All are ultimately derived from PHS [hay], an adjective meaning “good”, as in Egyp. y'hjw “be good” (EHD I, 22), CA dial. hay “good” and also in CA and other Semitic languages in compound words as the following examples will demonstrate:

1) PHS proot \*hai- is seen in CA and other Semitic languages in some traditional trilaterals as is CA CVII 'ammhā (< \*'inmahā), which means according to Asma'i, “be in a critical situation for something sinful or evil” (LA., r. mhy) = Sab. nhy “to confess a sin” (SD: 95). The underlying meaning of CA and Sab. words is “(be) *Not* good, be sinful”, the opposite of “(be) good”. The interesting thing about CA and Sab. words is that they use the same PHS biliteral \*hay- “good”, but with two different PHS negative prefixes: CA uses [m-] and Sab. [n-]. For negatives [n-] & [m-] “no(t)”, see below §§2.21.3 & 2.21.4 respectively.

1a) It is equally interesting to note that CA has a trilateral [nhy] containing PHS intensive \*n- and expressing “magnanimous; magnanimity, valor” (for this \*n-, see §2.11, n. 6 above). Thus CA [nhy] and Sab. [nhy] above are deep rather than surface cognates. Instances of false cognates are likewise abounded in Semitic languages.

1b) This is, however, not all. CA also has another trilateral [shy] containing PHS caus. prefix \*š- plus [hay] and expressing “be generous; generous”; sahā'u "generosity"; sahiy “generous” (for causative \*š-, see §2.2. above). For the relationship between



‘good’ and ‘generous’: cf. CA ḡaiyidu “good” > ḡawādu “generous”; ḡūdu “generosity” (LA, r. ḡwd), hai “good”; hairu “better than” > haiyiru “generous”, etc.

2) In going back to CA hāra, Akk. hāru, etc. above, we find that final \*-r- is originally a PHS comparative suffix becoming permanently part of the root in Semitic. This suffix is preserved in Egyp. as an independent entity: /r/ “more than” (see n. 3 below) and in CA hairu “better (than)” = Eth. hēr “good” (Rabin, 1975: 90, n. 34), Nab. ḥyr “good” in the expression bḥyr “for good” (= CA bi hair-in id.), Pal. ḥyrwn “rejoicing” (NWSI, I, 370) = CA hairu, SA: Meh.hayr “good”, Soq. ḥayr id., Berb.: Kab. hir id., Chad.: Gava xwara “good”.

My statement above «*This proto-suffix has been preserved intact in CA hairu*» may appear as a direct contradiction of previous one «... *the suffix becoming permanently part of the root in Semitic*». In fact, the two statements are complementary in the sense that the suffix is always part of the root in CA, but the word *hairu*, unlike all other adjectives in the entire language, explicitly tells us that its final /-ru/ is a comparative suffix. To see why this so, it is sufficient to notice that CA forms the comparative with the stem [ʾaFḡaLu], i.e. by adding a prefix /ʾa-/ to the positive form of the adjective and using the preposition /min/ “than” after the adjective, while the superlative is formed by adding the particle /ʾal-/ to the comparative adjective. These two morphological methods of forming the comparative and superlative in CA have no parallels in other Semitic languages. In BHeb., Aram., and Eth., for example, the comparative is commonly expressed by the ordinary positive form of the adjective followed by *min* “from”, and the superlative in a number of ways, the most common of which is to place *kōl* “all” after /min/ (cf. O’Leary, 1969: §133). The CA stems for the comparative {ʾaFḡaLu} and superlative {ʾal-ʾaFḡaLu} are as follows:

<i>Positive</i>	<i>Comparative</i>	<i>Superlative</i>
ḥasanu “fair”	ʾa- ḥsanu min “fairer than”	ʾal-ʾaḥsanu
kabīru “big”	ʾa-kbaru min	ʾal-ʾakbaru
ṭawilu “tall/long”	ʾa- ṭwalu min	ʾal-ʾaṭwalu
saʾīdu “glad”	ʾa-sʾadu min	ʾal-ʾasʾadu
ṣayīru “small”	ʾa- ṣyaru min	ʾal-ʾaṣyaru
wasiʾu “large”	ʾa-wsaʾu min	ʾal-ʾawsaʾu, etc.
But <i>hai</i> “good”	<i>hai-ru</i> min	*muḥ-

By analogy with the comparative stem [ʾaFḡaLu] to which all comparative adjectives conform, the comparative form {ʾaḥyaru} is cited in LA (see r. hyr) as a *second choice*, in the same way as some English dictionaries<sup>233</sup> cite *phenomenons*, for instance, as a second possible plural form of *phenomenon*. LA hastens, however, to clarify that

«If you want to express the comparative meaning, you should say: someone *hairu*..., and not *ʾaḥyaru*...(because *hairu*) can not be made dual or plural since it carries the meaning of ʾaFḡaLu = better than».

In earlier dictionaries like *Al-ʾAyn*, *Jamharah*, *Ṣiḥāḥ*, *Maḳāyis Al-Luḡah*, etc. *hairu*

<sup>233</sup> The American Heritage Dictionary, 1982, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.

“better than” is the only form. It is thus clear that the comparative *’aḥyaru* was later formed by analogy, and that it was described by Siyyūṭi as ‘*a bad term*’ (Muzhir I, 224). In the Koran, the comparative form is *always* *’hairu* as in (قال أنا خير منه), *He said I am better than him* (7: 12), (قول معروف ومغفرة خير من صدقة يتبعها أذى), *A kind word and pardon is better than charity that is followed by injury* (2: 263), etc. The same holds true for PIP: Al-ḥansā says:

«wa ḡad ḥāla ḥairun min ’unāsin...» (DKh, p. 130, L. 5).

Tarfah

«wa ’anta (’i)mru’un minnā, wa lasta bi-*hairi*-nā...» (DṬ, p. 111, L. 9).

A’sha says:

«’anta ḥayrun min ’alfi ’alfin min (’a)l ḡaumi...» (JAA, p. 221, line 48).

A similar example may be CA *sariy* = *hairu* “better”; *sarā*-tu = *hiyāru* “the best of” ~ also, *suwru* (said of camels) id. The positive form seems to be *saw* “good”, as a verb, *sawwa* “make good”, and the superlative *mus(t)awī* below. Suffixed /-r/ is also seen in CA *ṣadru* = “higher front of anything and its very beginning” (LA, r. ṣdr; Al ’ayn VII, 94). The positive form seems to be *ṣadadu* or *ṣaddu* = “located in the front, front, in front of, opposite to, side (of a mountain)” = Phoen. ṣd “side” (PG, 140), BAram. ṣad “side, against”, BHeb. ṣad “side” (OT, 882), Mand. ṣida, JAram., Targ., Syr. ṣd (MD. 393).

3) CA suffixed /-r/ is linguistically identical with Egyp. r “more than” as in *’š’ st r ḥt nbt* “they were more numerous than anything” (EG, §48; EHD I, 415). The earlier function of this [r] is a *preposition* signifying, like Sem. *min* above, “from” or more likely “in comparison with/to”.

4) In going back to Akk. *maḥrū* “first, before” = CA *muḥr*- “the best”, etc. above, we find that the trilateral [mḥr] is a compound comprising three morphemes: a *superlative prefix* \*mu-, *proot* \*ḥay, and *comparative suffix* \*-r-. A form without the comparative suffix is CA *muḥḥa*-tu (\*muḥya-tu) “the elite, the best of” = Akk. *muḥḥi* (\*muḥyi) “more than” (AG, 89).

The superlative [mu-] is also seen in some Semitic trilaterals as part of the root (see §2.19.4 below) and in some others as a prefix *mu*- or suffix *-mu*. Consider, for example, CA *muḥammadu* “most praiseworthy” in the PIP of A’sha:

«’ilaika ’abaita ’al la’ni kāna kalāluḥā

’ilā (’a)l māḡīdī (’a)l ḡarmi (’a)l ḡawādi (’a)l *muḥammadi*» (DA,

p. 100, L. 1).

The word consists of a prefix /mu-/ and the trilateral [ḥmd] as in ḥamada “to praise; to thank; glorious, of high or fine quality”, Sab. ḥmd “to praise, thank; thankfulness, glory” (SD, 68), BHeb. ḥemed “desirableness, pleasantness, beauty”; excellence; precious”; ḥemūdōt “man of God’s delight, i.e. *beloved of God*” (OT, 323), OCan., OffAram. ḥmd “something valuable, precious object”, Phoen. ḥmdh “good intention(s)” (cf. NWSI, I, 380-381).

In CA the positive form of mu-ḥammadu is *ḥamīdu* and the comparative is *’aḥmadu*. The positive form is still common as both *an adjective* and also *a personal name*, whereas the comparative is generally used only as *a personal name*, exactly like the

superlative *muḥḥamadu*<sup>234</sup>. The word is originally \*muḥmadu: pattern [muF'aLu]. Later, especially when /mu-/ seized to be productive and was no longer recognized as a superlative prefix, some superlative adjectives with /mu-/, like *muḥammadu*, were attracted to the adjectival stem {muFaʕʕaLu}, derived from CII verbs: cf. CA mu'allamu "educated" < 'allama "to teach", mulahḥaṣu "summarized" < laḥḥaṣa "to summarize", muḡarrabu "experienced" < ḡarraba "to try, experience", and so forth), while some others became autonomous roots like Akk. and CA [mhr] above.

5) The superlative mu- is doubtless present in the stereotyped expressions «ḡū'un (= hunger) *mudḡi'u*» and «*faḡrun* (= poverty) *mudḡi'u*». In both *mudḡi'u* = the worst, utmost (limit), greatest: daḡ'u "destitution, indigence, poverty, humiliation"; daḡi'u "abject, needy, mean". It is also present in *mutliy-atu* "the last", from talā "to follow, come after", tāliy-atu fem. adj.

#### Comments

a) The words *muḥḥya-tu* (in n. 4 above) and *nuḥba-tu* "the elite" are both based on [hai]. The /-b-/ could be from an orig. /-w-/ as in the related *naḥwa-tu*. Prefixed /nu-/ may not be variant of /mu-/, but rather the same as that discovered and studied in §2.11, n. 6 above.

b) A more important fact connected with *comparative* and *superlative* adjectives is the absence of *gender distinction* between masc. and fem. However, the language has a *fem. superlative ending* /ā/, i. e. ʕ = /y/ as in *hiya* (ʿa)ṣ *ṣuyrā* "she's the youngest" = *hiya* 'al 'a ṣyar id. The former is 'superlative of excellence'<sup>235</sup>.

**2.19.4** Visible traces of superlative *mu-* are still apparent in many substances derived from CA VIII verbs. This phenomenon may suggest that \*mu- had been widely used with CVIII deverbal adjectives before it seized to be productive. Some examples are:

i) *muntahā* "the utmost degree, limit or amount" ('intahā "be finished": nahā "to finish") as in: *muntahā* + 'as-sa'āda-tu (= the happiness) "the utmost degree of happiness", *muntahā* + 'at-ta'āsa-tu (= the wretchedness) "the utmost degree of wretchedness",

ii) *mustawī* "utmost of", defined in LA (r. swy as in *sawā* "good", etc. above) as: lit.

«*perfect (man) in the language of the Arabs who has attained the*

<sup>234</sup> Because of its signification, the word *muḥammadu* has been used as a personal name throughout the history of CA. Ibin Barri (LA, r. ḥmd) counts seven famous men in pre-Islamic times who were called Muḥammadu. The word was also used for the same purpose in other Semitic languages: cf. Sab. *nfs Mḥmd bn ḡt Ws't* = CA *nafsu Muḥammadin bin ḡāti Wus'ati* = "tomb (lit. 'soul') of Muḥammadu son of ḡt Ws't".

<sup>235</sup> Another equally important fact connected with the comparative adjective is that the language still has \*ʿa-šwā "better than", which is plainly a compound of comparative /ʿa/ and a bound root \*šaw = English \*bet- (of *better*) as in *the temperature today is ʿašwā than that of yesterday*. The word is found in SL and in some other dialects. The closest Egyp. cognate is š'w "god of prosperity and of good luck and good fortune".

*maximum (of wealth?) in his early life and the utmost degree of perfection in figure and mind»,*

iii) *muṣṭafā* (‘iṣṭafā ‘to choose or select for oneself’) as in *huwa ’al muṣṭafā* ‘He is the best chosen (one)’, etc.

#### Comments

There is a suffix /-n/ in CA which behaves as a superlative suffix, though it may not historically be as such.

In discussing the suffix /-n/ in *ra’ša-nu*, LA [r. r’š] states:

*«-nu was added to ra’šanu as they (= speakers of the language) added it to ’aṣ-ṣaidanu, who is ’al-’aṣyadu, e.g. the greatest of all kings».*

It is plainly evident that LA considers [ṣaid- + nu] as a superlative construction = ’al-’aṣyadu (see the superlative pattern above). The positive form is *ṣīdu*, used as coll., as in the famous verse of Mutanabbi:

*«...’am ’ābā’uhu ’aṣ ṣīdu», or his forefathers are great kings.*

It is also seen in the PIP of Labīd:

*«wa dāfa’tu ’anka ’aṣ ṣīda min ’āli dārimin...»* (DL, p. 63, line 3).

In going back in time to Farāhīdī (Al ’Ayn I, 255), we find that he considered /-n/ in *ra’šanu* as a substitute for (or variant of) of the comparative /’a-/ in ’al ’a-r’aṣu. He adds *«And so is ’al-’a-ṣyadu (of kings) is referred to as ’aṣ-ṣaiydanu»*. It seems that he treated the superlative prefix /’al/ and final /-n/ as having the same function.

Bin Faris (Ṣahibi, pp. 101-102) writes on affixes {m/n}:

*«I heard someone I trust (his mastery over the language) saying:  
... (The Arabs) refer to a person who is excessively (or  
exorbitantly) tall Tirimmāḥu, derived from ṭarḥu “distant, far”...».*

Bin Faris’ further explanation of the term clearly suggests that the affix expresses a type of what we may call ‘*superlative of deformation or pajoration*’. Similar examples he cites are *zurḳumu* ‘exceedingly blue’ (zrḳ: ’azraḳu ‘blue’), *ra’šanu* (r’š ‘quiver, tremble’ above), *ḥalbanu* (ḥlb ‘enchant’), *ṣildamu* (ṣld ‘strong’), and *ṣadḳamu*. These examples with suffixed /-m ~ -n/ show that /-m-/ and /-n/ are variants of the same morpheme<sup>236</sup>, and that /-m-/ in *Tirimmāḥu* is originally a suffix rather than infix. As a matter of fact, an alternative form *ṭurḥūmu* exists in the language (LA, r. ṭrmḥ), but the former is easier to pronounce than the latter. One may have noted that Bin Faris himself drives *ṭirimmāḥu* above from a root [ṭrḥ], thus treating /-m-/ as infix.

**2.19.2** Some basic words for ‘color’ in CA as *’aḥmaru* [ḥmr] ‘red’, *’aḥḍaru* [ḥḍr] ‘green’<sup>237</sup>, and *’aṣfaru* [ṣfr] ‘yellow’ present an interesting phenomenon. Each has a prefix /’a-/ (perh. *one who, one which*) and ends in /-r/ (meaning ?). The morpheme /’a-/

<sup>236</sup> But, see §2.11, n. 6 above.

<sup>237</sup> BHeb. ḥṣr id., Phoen., OAram. ḥṣr ‘herb, grass’, etc.

is also prefixed to other adjectives which do not terminate with -r, namely *'abyaḏu*<sup>238</sup> “white” and *'aswadu* “black”. Two other words for “color” are *'azraqu*<sup>239</sup> “blue”, and *'aṣḡaru* “reddish, blond”. The last cited may be from [ṣḡr] as in CA, or from [ṣrḡ] by metathesis as in BHeb. ṣrḡ “reddish, bay, fox-colored” (OT, 1020), NWS ṣrḡ “bloody” (NWSI II, 1194, see ṣrḡ 6). It is less likely that the CA form is derived from [ḡar], one of many CA terms for “(a kind of) *blood*” (this proot also found in HS). Thus it may not be cognate with BHeb.-Aram. words. However, in following Ibin Jinni’s theory (§2.2.51 above), the word appears to be a variant of CA *ṣariḡu* “red, reddish”, derived, exactly like those of BHeb.-Aram. and their cognates in other Semitic languages, from [ṣrḡ] “sunrise, east”. The following study of the etymology of [ḡmr] will allude remotely to the origin of final [-r] in all such adjectives.

Akk. emēru “be red”, BHeb. ḡamar “be red” (OT, 326), Sab. ḡmr “red” (SD, 68), CA CIX *'iḡmarra* “become red”, CXI *'iḡmārra* “become red”; ḡamāru “redness”. The difference in meaning between CA CIX and CXI stems is that the former denotes a *permanent condition (once something is red or becomes red it does not changes its color)*, while the latter denotes an *ephemeral or transitory condition*; ḡamira “to burn with anger”; ḡammāra-tu, adj. said of the Summer, “intense heat”; *'aḡmaru* “red”. All are from a stem \*ḡam “red” as in CA *'atḡmiy* [r. ṡḡm], with prefixed t-, “red”. The proot is certainly related to PHS stem \*ḡam- “to burn, be hot; fire, heat”, orig. a term for ‘sun’: see §2.2.6 above. It is to be noted, however, that *ḡaw-* alone denotes “red” in CA.

**2.19.3** BHeb. pṣr “to scatter, to spread” (Ryder, 1974: 115), CA fazara “to scatter”. Both are from older \*faḏar. While \*ḏ is \*z in Heb, it is /ḏ/ in CA. The change of \*-ḏ- to /-z-/ in CA is due to seq. const. In fact, initial /f-/ is seen before /-ḏ-/ in only one word: faḏḏu “single, individual”. Voiced /b/, on the other hand, can appear before /-ḏ-/ in CA, hence bḏr, Heb. bzr “scatter seed” (see §2.13.21 above), etc. The word \*pḏr above is a compound of \*f-, perh. “apart” and stem [ḏar] “scatter” (see §2.1.12, n. 3 above).

a) There is an *etymologically different triliteral* [pṣr] < \*pḏr. The word under focus here is *fizru*, which was Saad Bin Zaid’s nickname. He acquired his nickname because of his saying after his flock of goats had been scattered and plundered: lit. “*whoever takes one single goat (of my flock) it is (legally) his, but fizru must not be taken*” (see Jamharah II, 707, and for an account of the story, see LA). Arab lexicographers interpreted *'fizru* as signifying ‘two or more’ (see LA).

This the second time I see in CA a word like *'fizru* plainly containing the comparative suffix [-r], the first being hai-ru “better than” in §2.19.1 above.

The word *fizru* is a compound of at least two morphemes [paḏ-] “single, individual” and the comparative suffix [-r]. The first element is seen in faḏḏu “single individual”; CIV *'afaḏḏa*, said of a sheep, “to give birth to a single kid”; *mi-fḏāḏu* “a sheep that is accustomed to give birth to a single kid” (LA; ṢḤḤ II, 780).

<sup>238</sup> The word *'abyaḏu* is related to *bayḏa-tu* “egg”, pl. bayḏu, BHeb. *bēṣīm* pl., Syr. *bē'tā*: cf. Rabin, 1975: 87.

<sup>239</sup> Akk. *zarrīḡ-* “aux yeux iridescents”, Syr. *zārḡā* “bleu, vert bleu”, Ge. *'azraq* “bleu somber”, etc. (DRS VIII, 802).

The meaning of *pizru* is plainly “*more than one*” and not “two and more” as old Arab scholars wrongly assume. It is this meaning that is under focus in the story, and not “two and more”. The owner of the flock, as the story tells, said: one is allowed to take *one* goat and not *fizru*, i.e. *more than one*. This is to say, the real meaning of *fizru*.

**2.19.4** Like *muḥammadu* in §2.19.1 above, the CA superlative *muḥaddamu* expresses “before all others, first, foremost”; *ḡadmu* “before, in front, first”; *ḡuddāmu* “before, in front”; adv. *ḡuduma*, Eth. superl. *ḡadāmī* “first”, Syr. superl. *ḡadmāyā* id., Mand. *ḡadmaia* “first, primal, primeval”, Talm. *ḡāmā* “first”; *ḡāmē* “before” (Moscatti, 1969: §14.7; MD, 399, 400), Phoen., OAram., OffAram., Palm., JAram., etc. *ḡdm* “before”, Pun. *ḡdm* “first-fruit” (NWSI II, 987ff), BAram. *ḡdm* “first, before” (Rosenthal, 1963: 94), Sab. *ḡdm* “firstborn”; *mḡdmt* “vanguard” (SD, 103) = CA *muḡadama-tu* id.

1) Semitic [*ḡdm*] is a compound of two elements:

1a) [*ḡad*], a substance meaning “front (n. or adj.)” and is ultimately the same as \**ḡad-* “head” as in Akk. *ḡaḡḡadu*, etc. “head” (see §2.17.10 above). For the semantic relationship between ‘first’ and ‘head’: cf. Akk. *rēš-tu* “first” < *rēšu* “head” (Gray, 1971: §269), CA = *ra’su* “head” also “first”.

1b) Final /-m/ of [*ḡdm*] is a superl. affix and is etymologically different from that of [*ḡdm*] in n. 2 below.

2) The stem [*ḡad*] above is perhaps ultimately the same as another [*ḡad*] “before in time, former”. This is seen in the homophonous trilateral [*ḡdm*] as in CA *ḡadīmu* “ancient, old, former”; comparative *’aḡdamu* “more ancient, older”; adv. *ḡadīm-an* “previously”, Sab. *ḡdm* “former, previous”, adv. *ln-ḡdm-m* “previously” (SD, 104), Phoen., OffAram., JAram., etc. *ḡdm* “the time before; formerly” (NWSI II, 987ff). For a semantic relationship: CA *’wl* means both “first” and “former”, etc. (§3.17.15 above).

3) Stem [*ḡad*] in n. 1 and 2 above may also be related to CA *ḡad*<sup>240</sup>, which is used as an auxiliary to express *an event which occurred at some definite or indefinite time before a fixed point in the past* as in *ḡad ra’aytahu ḡabla ’an ’ātī* “I had seen him before I came”. In MSA and many modern dialects, there is a strong tendency to substitute a form of *kāna* “be” for *ḡad*, hence *kuntu ra’aytahu...* “I had seen him...”.

‘*ḡad*’ can be omitted as in the Koran: (كيف تكفرون بالله وكنتم أمواتا فأحياكم), lit. *How can you disbelieve in God; for you were lifeless (in your mother’s womb), and He brought you to life* (2: 28). The sentence «كنتم أمواتا» /*kuntum ’amwātan*/ = *you were lifeless* (lit. dead) should have been, according to Farrā’u (LA), *ḡad kuntum ’amwātan* = *had been lifeless...*

This same [*ḡad*] is seen in some Eth. languages with the signification “before” as in S., W. *bä-ḡädä* id., in Har. *-ḡada* (preceded by the imperfect) signifies “before” (HED, 122). When preceded by the imperfect, CA *ḡad* may express “may be, be possible” as in *ḡad ya’ti ḡadan* “He may come tomorrow”.

4) There is still a third compound trilateral [*ḡdm*] as in CA *ḡadamu* “foot” > *ḡadima* “to come (on foot)”. To my understanding, the notion of ‘foot’ is orig. used as ‘measure’, as it still does (§2.1.6.7, n. 6c above).

<sup>240</sup> It may be a compound of *ḡ-* (§2.17.83 above) and HS \*-d- “past, before in time”.

## 2.20 SOME HS DEMONSTRATIVES, ADVERBS INTERROGATIVES AND PREPOSITIONS

HS demonstratives, interrogatives, prepositions, etc. are immensely old to be relevant to this study. In fact, they are much older than any HS trilateral or quadrilateral. One group of them, the demonstratives, are also much older than the Semitic system of personal pronouns which is indeed based upon them.

**2.20.1** Min., Qat. mty, Had. mt “when” (Beeston, 1962: 64), CA matā “what time, i.e. *when*”, Akk. immatī<sup>241</sup>, Assy. mati “when”, BHeb. mātay, Syr. ’emta id., Talm. ’ēmat, Mand. ’amat id. (MD, 352), OffAram., Hatra ’(y)mt “when” (NWSI I, 79).

PHS \*[ma- + -t-] = “what + time”: \*ma- “what” as in CA, Aram., Syr. mā, BHeb. mā, Eth. ma id. (O’Leary, 1969: §102, Gray, 1971: §280, Wright, 1966: 120ff), Phoen. m “what”, ’m “who” (PG, 55), Egyp. m(’) “what, who” (EG: §§227, 496; EHD I, 279), Cush., Chad. \*ma, mi (RPAA, n. 571). The proot \*-t(y) “time” is seen in Egyp. t’ ~ ty “time” (EHD II, 815, 821) ~ ’d id. (EHD I, 14), Ug. h-t “now” (UG, 534) = CA hat’ or hit’ “portion of time, time”; hat’a-tun ~ had’a-tun “some time”.

1) The very same word is also seen as [matā] in CA, a rare variant is seen only in Poet. as in:

«’alam t-as’al (’a)l ’aṭlāla: *mattā* ’uhuduhā...»<sup>242</sup>

2) The wh-word /ma/ ~ /mā/, which can freely occur as an independent interrogative, is seen in a number of compounds such as:

2a) CA māḏā “what, i.e. *what + this*” BHeb. mazze id.: CA ḏā “this”, Amorite, OAram. z, BHeb. zē, Bib.Aram. dā, Syr. dā, Phoen., Pu. z, Eth. ze, Sab. ḏ id. (NWSI I, 299f, O’Leary, op.cit: §88).

2b) CA limā “*for + what* (what for), i.e. *why*”, OAram. lmh id (Rosental, AG, 11), Phoen., BHeb. lmh id. (PG, 116): CA li “for”, OAram. l, etc. gen. Sem. id. Similarly, ’ilāmā “why” from ’ilā “to” plus mā “what”.

2c) CA mim mā “from what”: cf. CA min “from” > mim- by regressive assim., i.e. *the /-n-/ changes its point of articulation to match that of the following /m/*; and by an identical process CA ’an mā “about what” > ’ammā (Koran 29: 13): cf. CA ’an “about”, etc.

CA min “from” = Phoen., Pun., EHeb. m(n) id. (NWSI II, 649; PG, 120), Syr. men

<sup>241</sup> Akk. initial i-, Syr. e-, etc. are from ’ay (see §2.20.2 below): SL matā or ’aymtā (~ ’ay matā) “when”, the latter is much more commonly used than the former and consists of three obvious elements ’ay “which” + -m(a) “what” + -tā “time”.

<sup>242</sup> LA reports that Abu Hatim asked Aṣma’i about the meaning of [mattā]. Aṣma’i replied: *I don’t know*. However, Abu Hatim’s view is that the poet (= Muzāhim Uḡayli) repeated the radical to express ‘*emphasis*’ or he wanted to use the *maṣdar*: *matattu*, *mattā* = “very ancient, old times, long time”.

id., Eth. 'am, 'amna id. (O'Leary, 1969: 270), Egyp. m id. (EHD I, 264).

2d) PHS \*mi “from” is seen in CA /mu-/ as in mu-δ ~ mu-(n)δu “since” (lit. “from then”), BHeb. mē-'āz “since” (lit. “from then”), Eth. 'em-ze id., (O'Leary *ibid.*; Gray, 1971:§291).

The combination of *mi* (or *min*) with *δu* yields a compound expressing lit. “from this” and not “from that time or from then”. To express “since”, the compound must have 'iδ rather than *δu* as its second element. From the time of Farāhīdi (Al 'ayn VIII) onward, all Arab scholars have considered *munδu* as a compound consisting of /mi/ “from”, infix /-n-/ which can be dropped or maintained, and /'iδ/ as in CA 'iδ, 'iδ-an “then, of time past” also “when”, Sab. 'δ “when” (SD, 2), BHeb. 'āz “then, of time past”, BAram. 'd (OT, 28).

As for the vowel /-u-/ in *muδ*, it is due to *vowel harmony*: CA \*mi'iδu > \*miδu > *muδu*. (for this phonological process in CA, see §2.7 above).

2e) One can easily see that CA *matā* has a number of different origins. One of such origins has been shown above and expresses “what + time”. Another expresses “from” and seems to be a compound of /m/ “from” and \*-t- perh. ‘time’ or ‘demonstrative’. This particular meaning of *matā* was most common in old Huthaiyil dialect. For other meanings, see LA.

2f) The very same /mā/ is also seen in OAram., DAram., Samal, OffAram., Palm., Hatra, JAram., Nab. *mn* “who”, Akk. *ma-nu* id. (NWSI II, 648), CA *man* (variants *manū*, *manī*) “who”, Eth.: Ge. *mannū*, acc. *manna*, Amh *mān*, acc. *mānan*, Te., Tna. *mān*, Assy. nom. *mannu*, *mannum* (O'Leary, 1969: §103). All such forms are ultimately from the interrogative *mā* as in Egyp. m “what, who” above, CA *mā* id. as in the Koran: (والسما وما بناها), *By the heaven and who built it* (see Šahibi, p. 175). The expected form here is *man* and not *mā*.

3) For Ug. ht “now”, orig. {this + time}: comp. CA 'al'ān “now”, from {'al “this” + 'ān “time”}. Ug. ht is cognate with CA hityu or 'ahtāu pl. “hour of the night, time” above, and its \*-t = CA \*-t in *lāta* lit. “not time”, from *lā* “not” + \*-t “time”. Farāhīdi (Al 'ayn VIII, 369) states:

«As for [lāt], it is used as a negative just like [lā], but (it differs from lā in that) it is used to negate 'azmān (= times), as in the Koran: lāta ḥīna manāšin».

He further adds:

«The Arabs prefix t- to 'al'ān and ḥīn “(proper) time” and say: tal'ān and taḥīn».

To Farāhīdi, the Koranic verse *lāta ḥīna manāšin* = *lā ḥīna manāšin*.

**2.20.2** CA 'ayna “where”, BHeb. 'ayin id. (OT, 44), Akk. *ayyān-*, *yān-*, etc. (DRS I, 16-17). All are from a compound of [ʾay- + n-] “what or which place”: PHS \*ʾay-<sup>243</sup>

<sup>243</sup> It is related to 'āya-t “individual, person” as in ra'ai-tu (I saw) 'āyati-hi (his person, his figure) “I saw him”. This is the same word denoting “sign, a sign or token (of anything not clearly visible or discernable)” as in BHeb. 'ōt, BAram. 'āt (OT, 27). It also expresses in BHeb. “flag, ensign”, an idea expressed in CA by *rāyatu* “his flag, his characteristic sign, his mark”, which is from ra' 'āyatu? (ra'ā “to see”; ri ~ rih imper. “see!”).



“which, who, what” as in Akk., CA ’ayyu, Eth. ’ay, Syr. ay-, BHeb. ’ē, ’ayy, Ge., Har. ’ay, Te. ’ayi (Wright *ibid.*; O’Leary, 1969: §106; DRS I, 16) and \*n- is prob. “demonstrative” = Egyp. n’ “this” (EHD I, 341, Gardiner, EG. 572). In Semitic \*n appears as a prefix: n-, ni-, etc., and a suffix -n- (O’Leary, *op.cit.*: §93). Examples of suffixed -n are below.

### Comments

The analysis of \*-na as demonstrative above is *wrong*. To my understanding, the word is a particle signifying ‘place’ or “this in the sense this (near) place” (see -ka in §2.20.3 below). On the other hand, CA ’annā = ’ayna “whence”, is from \*’aynana, y > -n by assim.: \*’annana is impossible to pronounce, becoming ’annā, which is a compound of \*’ay “what”, \*-n- \*place, and \*-nā or \*-na “from”, hence Koranic: *whence hast thou this?* (3: 37), where ’annā signifies lit. “from where”. It also means “to” as in Poet.

«...’annā tawaġġaha...» “to wherever place he goes” (LA).

The same ’annā also signifies both “how” as in the Koran: يكون لي ولد ولم يمسنني بشر (أنى), and “when” as in the Koran: Koran (أنى شئتم), *when(ever) you please* (2: 223). When it is used with the signification ‘how’, it is definitely a compound of [’ay] “what” and [nā] “this” above”, and when used with the signification ‘when’, it is from [’ay] and [nā] or [na] “time”.

Cognates are Old Aram., OffAram. ’n “where(ever)” (NWSI I, 79), BHeb. ’ān “where”; mē-’ān “whence”, ’ad-’ān “until when? how long?”, from ’ayin (OT, 69-70). In Egyp. yn = CA ’n, and in both languages the word is used as “*mark of emphasis*”, “*a conditional particle*”, “*interrogative particle*”, and also “*a post negative particle*” (as in CA ’a-zaidā-nīh) (EHD I, 56-57; LA).

**2.20.3** Akk. ’ayka, ’ēka, Ug. ’ik, BHeb. ’ēkā ~ EHeb. ’ykn, Syr. aykā, etc. “where” (Gray, 1971: §§276, 253, Wright 1966: 120ff, DRS I, 16): a compound [’ay- + -ka-] “what or which place”: ’ay = “which, what” and -ka- = “demonstrative “at or in that place”, i.e. *locative*. The establishment of both \*n and \*k as demonstratives calls for a difference in use or meaning between them. Available evidence permits us to put forward at least three demonstratives: \*-n- = *near demonstrative*, \*-k- = *distant demonstrative*, and \*-l- = *farthest*: cf. CA *hunā* “here”; *hunāka* “there”; and *hunālika* “over there” (Bin Faris, Ṣahibi, p. 115)

Also consider CA *ḏā* “this” (OAram. z, Sab. ḏ, etc. above), *ḏāka* “that yonder” (Ge. zekū id., BAram. masc. dēk, fem. dāk id., Mand. haek for hadēk id. = CA hāḏāka “that” from hāḏā “this”: cf. O’Leary, 1969: §92), and CA *ḏālika* “that (far)” (Syr. hārka for hālka: cf. O’Leary *ibid.*).

Like CA /n/, Akk. *annu* expresses “this” = “near” demonstrative” (cf. AG, 35, Moscati, 1969: § 13.30) and *ullū* “far, distant” (cf. Moscati, *op.cit.*: §13.31). Both \*l and \*k are also found in a number of CA demonstratives, one of which is *tilka* fem. “that”: cf. tā, tih fem. “this”<sup>244</sup>

<sup>244</sup> This fem. /t/ is seen in the feminine singular relative /’allatī/ “one who” from ’altī, a compound of /’al/ “the, this” and /tī/ “this (fem.)” (cf. LA, letter t), Ge. ’əlla pl., Sab., Qat. ’l,

CA *hunā* “here” above = BHeb. *hēnnāh* “hither”, Ug. *hunny* “here” (UG, 533): a compound of [\*ha- + \*-na]. A form with a doubled /n/ exists in CA: *hannā* ~ *hinnā*. The element \*ha- probably has the same meaning and function as /ha-/ in CA masc. *hāḏā* “this”; fem. *hāḏih*, BHeb. masc. *hazze*, *haze*; fem. *hazzōt* id., Aram. fem. *hadā*, Syr. *hāda* id. (cf. CA *ḏā*, BHeb. *zē*, etc. above “this masc.”, CA *ḏī* fem.). This element may, according to LA, be used alone or prefixed to other demonstratives for the sake of emphasis or drawing attention: CA *hātā* ~ *tā* “this (fem.)” and *hāḏā* ~ *ḏā* “this (masc.)” as in *hāḏā* ‘*ahūka* or *ḏā* ‘*ahūka* “this (masc.) is your brother” (adopted from LA).

It is most likely, however, that Semitic \*h- in the words above originally meant “a place near at hand, close by”, hence = Egyp. *h*’ id. (EHD I, 438), and this meaning has survived in many expressions as in CA *hā huwā* “here he is!” (*hā* in this expression = right here, implying *nearness*). This special meaning of /h/ was recognized by old Arab scholars (see, for example, ṢḤḤ VI, 2560). O’Leary (1969: §89), apparently following old Arab scholars (see ṢḤḤ VI, 2557-2558) identifies this /ha/ «with the first part of the stem *huwa* (*he*), *hiya* (*she*), with vowel assimilated to the following semivowel». He also finds that the same /ha/ «appears as *hē* in Gen. xlvii, 23; Ezek. xvi, 43; and in Aram. as *hā* “lo!” in Dan. iii, 25; and in Syr. *hā*...The same particle appears as a suffix in Abyssinian ‘*ethā* “this time”, where its use is adverbial, and so Heb. -ā in ‘*attā* “now”»<sup>245</sup>: Cush. \*ha “this, this one” (RPAA, n. 767).

The \*h- is also used as an interjection as in Egyp. *h*’ “O” (EHD *ibid.*) = CA, Syr., BAram. *hā* id. (OT, 241).

As pointed out above, the demonstrative [-n-] indicates “near demonstrative” and [-k-] “distant demonstrative”. This distinction is also seen in Akk., etc. *ayka* “where”, perhaps originally implying “distant location”; CA ‘*ayna*, implying “near location”.

**2.20.4** Akk. ‘*ayka*, BHeb. ‘*ēkā*, etc. above (§2.20.3 above) also express “how” (Gray, 1971: §§276, 253), also OAram., OffAram. ‘*yk* “how” (NWSI I, 45), Har. āykau(t) “how”, Z. *ayku*, S. *aynā-ko* id. (HED, 38). The second element \*ka is from \*ka “as, like, for, etc.” as in Assy. *kī* “as, for, like” (King, 1898: 350), OAram. *k* “as, like” (Rosenthal, AG, 11), BHeb. *ke*, *ka*, Eth. *ka* (Gray, *ibid.*, §291), Sab. *k* conj. “that, when, as, so that, because”; prep. “like, as” (SD, 75-76), CA *ka* “as, like”, *ka-mā* “as, like, according to”, Assy. *kīma* id. (King *ibid.*). For the origin of Akk. ‘*ayka* “how”, etc, see §2.20.5, esp. n. 5a below.

The use of one interrogative to express both “where, whence” and “why” finds parallels in CA where ‘*annā* expresses ‘how” and “when, whence” (see §2.20.2 above,

---

Min. hl. The same analysis holds true for the masc. sg. relative /’allaḏī/ from /’al/ and /ḏī/ masc. “this”, masc. pl. ‘*allaḏīna*, another form is masc. pl., ‘*ulā(’)*, which can be used alone or with the definite article /’al’ulā/ (LA ‘wl). In addition, the same demonstrative is also seen in the feminine *tī-ka*, *ti-l-ka* = masc. *ḏā-ka*, *ḏā-li-ka* (LA). One can say *ḏī* fem., but never \**ḏīka* or \**ḏilka*.

The dimin. form of *tīka* fem. is *taiyāka* and of *tilka* is *taiyālika*. On the other hand, the dimin. of *ḏāka* masc. is *ḏaiyāka* and of *ḏālika* is *ḏaiyālika*.

<sup>245</sup> The identification of h- above with [hw] (*huwa*) “he” and [hy] (*hiya*) “she” is another way of saying that Semitic \*-w marks masc. gender and \*-y fem. gender.

under *Comments*).

**2.20.5** CA *kaifa* “how, as” as in *kaifa* (’anta) “how are (you)” is analyzed by Gray (1971: §§276, 292) as: *the word without* (initial) *k* = Eth. ’efō “as”; *without k-ai-* = BHeb. pōh “here”; PSem. \*’ap “and also” as in BHeb. ’ap, Syr. ’āp, CA *fa*. Gray wants to say that *kaifa* is a compound of \**k-* as in CA *ka* “as, like” and \**-p-*. My view on this word concurs with Gray’s view in one major point; that is, the word is a compound, but diverges greatly on the formative elements of the compound.

1a) If I study the word as a separate element in the language having no relation to other elements, I will confidently state as a fact that the word is a compound of *kai* “like” and \**-f-* “what”. The signification ‘how’ has developed from ‘like what’ or ‘by what’. The element \**ka* is related to [*ka*] “as, like”, etc. above (§2.20.4) and to *kai* (i.e. *kay*) as in CA *kai* “in order that”, Akk., BHeb. *kī*, Eth. *kē*, Syr. *kai* id.; also BHeb. *kī* “that”, Syr. *kai*, Eth. *kē* “therefore” (Gray, 1971: §§276, 292), also belong here Chad.: Log. *ká* “mit”, Jegu *ka*, etc., SA: Meh. *ka-* “mit”, Shh., Soq. *ke-* id. (Müller, 1975: 71, n. 91). As for \**-f-*, it exists in Egyp. (see n. 3b below).

1b) If I compare the word with some elements in the language like *ka’ay-* (see 5 below), I will analyze the word as a compound of three elements: [*ka*] above, [*’ai*] “what”, and \**-f-* “be”, with the loss of /-’-/ becoming [*kaif*]. This is a correct analysis of the word, which can also account for another common signification of *kaifa* “state, condition, howsoever it may be, at any rate”.

The first syllable *kai-* “what” is morphologically identical with *ka’ai* or *ka’aiyin*, which also signifies “how many/much”, hence one can say: *bi-ka’aiyin tabī hāḏā ’al kitāb?* “How much do you sell this book?” = *kam* “how much, how many” as in *bi kam tabī hāḏā ’al kitāb?* “how much do you sell this book” (*bi* = “with, by”). Jawhari considers the addition of /-k/ to [*’ay*] as serving to express كثرة ‘abundance’ (LA), and here may lie the basic difference in meaning between *ka’ay-n* and *kam* (< \**ka’ay-m*). See n. 5 below.

2) The second syllable \**-fa* is linguistically identical with \**-fa* in *saufa* سوف “will, shall (be)”. The particle *saufa* is prefixed to the imperfect to express futurity, and is called by Arab grammarians حرف تنقيس وتأخير *a particle of amplification and delay*.

CA *saufa* has been wrongly connected with BHeb.-Aram [*swp*] as in EHeb. *h-swp* caus. “be finished, run out” as in *’d hswp dgn* “until the grain runs out or is finished” (NWSI II, 780), BHeb. *sōp* “end”; BAram. *swp* “to have an end” (OT, 716), OffAram. *sp*, JAram., *swp* “end” (NWSI II, 796), Syr. *swp*, Mand. *sup* “to finish, vanish, end, disappear” (MD, 323).

There is no denying, however, that Aram and Heb. words above are cognate with an etymologically different [*swf*]. The genuine CA cognate is obviously *sawāfu* “death, i.e. end”: CI *sāfa*, but the more common is CIV *’asāfa* (= BHeb. *hswp*) “to die, perish”. This particular [*swf*] seems to be a compound of caus. \**s-* and \**wp* “to die” (see §§2.1.6.5.22 & 2.11.29, esp. 6a above).

3) As for CA *saufa*, it is a compound of *sa* {س ~ *sau* سوف} “will” and \**-fa* {ف} “be”. The forms *sa* and *saufa* have been used interchangeably throughout the history of the language. Some examples from the Koran are:

3a) /sa-/: (سنكتب ما قالوا), *we will record what they say* (3:181), (سيحلفون بالله) *and they will swear by God* (9: 42).

3b) /saufa/: (سوف تعلمون), *you will know* (11:93), (وان سعيه سوف يرى), *And that his striving will soon be seen* (53:40).

LA [sws] adds a fourth variant *saf* {سف} and tends to consider /-fa/ as a suffix. The word is a reduced form of PHS \*p' - "to be, exist" as in Egyp. p' id. (HED I, 230), this is in turn a voiceless variant of the PHS proot seen in CA bā'a "to dwell, live" (§2.9.22 above).

4) Ahmad Bin Faris (ML III, 116-117) states that [swf] expresses three root meanings:

4a) "smelling" as in Poet., Ru'bah says:

«'iōā ('a)d dalīlu ('i)stāfa 'ahlāka ('a)ṭ ṭuruḵ».

Imri' Al Qais says:

«wa minhunna sawft ('a)l ḥauda ḡad ballaha ('a)n nadā» (DI, p. 130, L.

7).

The most commonly used derivative expressing this notion in CA and in all forms of modern Arabic is *ma-sāfa-tu* fem. "distance", so-called because a guide, when he gets lost, used to smell the soil (= sāfa) to make sure that he is on the right way: Cush.: Oromo suf- "to smell" (HSED, n. 2282).

4b) "loss, running out" (e.g. of *māl*, i.e. *what one owns of domestic animals*. Nowadays, the word *māl* is common only as the term for "money" and not 'domestic animals'). This meaning is identical with that expressed its BHeb. and Aram. cognates in n. 2 above.

4c) "delay" as in *saufa 'aktubu* "I will write", i.e. *delaying or putting off writing to some other time*.

5) Returning to CA \*ka'ayfa > kayfa, its first two elements {ka + 'ay} are morphologically identical with CA ka'ay ~ ka'aiy(in) ~ kāy(in) "how many, how much" as in the Koran: (وكأين من نبي), *How many a prophet* (3:145). Farāhīdi rightly considered the word a compound of {ka} "as, like" plus 'ai or 'ay (see LA, r. kyn). To him (Al 'Ayn VIII, 441), the word is based on [ay], while /ka-/ here = /ka-/ in kam above, and /-n/ = *tanwīn* (ṢHH V, 2277). BHeb. *kēn* "so many, so much" as in Ex. 10, 14 and Judg. 21, 14 is cognate (OT, 473-474).

5a) The only difference between Akk. 'ayka "how", etc. above (lit. which + like) (§3.20.4 above) and CA ka'ay (lit. like + which) lies, in my opinion, *in word order*. Akk. uses *ka* "as, like" as a suffix, whereas CA uses it as a prefix. Thus, Akk. -ka in {ayka} is not a demonstrative.

As for Jawhari's view that \*k- expresses a sort of *plural of abundance*, the problem with most old Arab scholars is that when they deal with morphology they do not always explain their views, but that when they deal with syntax (or even with phonology) they leave nothing without explanation even *the obvious*. It has been found that [k-] signifies "all" (see §2.1.6.8, n. b above). For *pl. of abundance*, see §2.23.10, n. 3 below.

6) To the family of \*k above also belong among others CA kam "how many? how much?" = BHeb. kamāh, kameh "*how much? how may? how often*" (OT, 540), in NWS kam' "how much?" (NWSI II, 515). Farāhīdi analyzed the word as a compound of \*ka-

above (i.e. كاف التشبيه, i.e. *as, like*) and \*m- the reduced form of mā “what” (Al ‘Ayn V, 286), Egyp. my “*like what?, How?*” (EHD I, 277). Farra’ elaborated on Farāhīdī’s statement saying: *kam is from/ mā/, /ka-/ was added to it initially, and -ā (of mā) was dropped because of its frequent use.* A similar instance of loss of /-ā/ in mā for the same reason is lim “why, i.e. *for what?*”, and a similar instance for the obvious and unquestionable addition of /ka/ is *kamuḍ* “since”: muḍ ~ munḍu id.: §2.20.1, n. 2d above (Ṣahibi, p. 162). The original meaning of the compound is *the like of what?*

**2.20.6** Phoen. bn, OAram. bny, OffAram., Palm., JAram. byn “between” (NWSI I, 152-153), BHeb. bēyn, bēn “between”; bēnayim “space between two armies”, CA bayna “between”; baynu-n “interval”, Aram. baynat, bēn “between”, Syr. baynay, Eth. bayna, baynāt id., Akk. ʾina bīrīt (\*ʾina baynāt) “between, among”, (Gray, 1971: §291; O’Leary, 1969: 268), also Akk. bīru, bēru “between, among” (AG, 7), Sab. byn “in both of two things, between, among” (SD, 34).

Semitic bayn- is undoubtedly a compound comprising two parts: a preposition \*bi (cf. Ug., Phoen. b, CA bi, BHeb. bə, ba, Syr. bə, ESA b, Soq. be, Eth. ba, etc. “in, at, by, with, etc.” (DRS II, 39). The second, no matter whether it is \*-yn or \*-yr, is a prep. signifying “in”, and not from the dual marker [-yn]: cf. Akk. ina “in, by, on” (GA, 79), Egyp. [yn] “in, to, by”, [n] “in, to, for” and [r] “to, with, at, etc.”. The orig. meaning of the compound is ‘*within*’.

**2.20.7** CA ʾayyāna “when”, i.e. *what time*, as in the Koran: (يسأل أيان يوم القيامة), *He asks: when is the Day of resurrection* (75: 6), Assy. anu, ani “when” (O’Leary, 1969: 176), a compound of \*ʾay- “what” (cf. CA ʾayy-u id.: see §2.20.2 above) and \*ʾāna < ʾāna “time”, hence the original full form phrase ʾayyu ʾān- “what time” > ʾayyāna. The word [ʾān] is seen in CA ʾal-ʾāna “now (lit. this time)” (-ʾāna is an extended form of PHS \*n-as in HEgy. nw “time” above). Semitists do not differentiate between this -n and demonstrative -n in CA ʾayna above in §2.20.4 above (O’Leary ibid.). Bin Faris and other old Arab scholars (Ṣahibi, p. 146) correctly considered ʾayyāna as a compound of [ʾay] “what” and ʾawānu “time”. They also traced ʾal-ʾāna “now” above to ʾawānu (op.cit: 147).

1) A similar compound involving the first element /ʾay-/ is seen in CA ʾiyš “what”. Thaʿalibi (FL, §53, p. 330) compares the CA compound word ʾayyāna with ʾiyš, ʾiš (SL ʾayš, but in other dialects the form is usually ʾēš) “what”, from ʾay “what” plus šay’ “thing” = Egyp. š-t pl. id. (EHD II, 721). A form šō ~ šū “what” also exists in most dialects including SL, and is a truncated form of CA ʾayyu šay’(-in) via ʾīyš ~ ʾiš (in SL via ʾayš)<sup>246</sup>.

<sup>246</sup> The word šay’ “thing” is seen in many modern compounds as SL *maʾlayš*, in most other modern dialects *maʾlēš* “don’t worry, never mind”, consists of *ma* “not”, *ʾlay* “on (concerning)”, and *šay*; *layš* “why”, from *li* “for” + ʾay “what” + šay’; *balāš* “for nothing, free (of charge), gratis”, from *balā* “without” + šay’; ʾaddayš “how much, how many, how long” is clearly from ʾad ʾayš (from ʾad ʾayš), where ʾad (i.e. ʾad) “the like or the worth of what” (orig. a measure), it is the same [ʾad] in ʾad mā baddak “as much/many as you want”, etc.

The reduced form /-š/ of šay’ “thing” in *layš*, *balāš*, ʾaddayš, etc. is etymologically identical

**2.20.8** OffAram. bl'dy, Nab. bl'd "except" (NWSI I, 167), BHeb. bl'dy "not unto, nothing to or for, without" (OT, 137). Semitic \*bl'd is evidently a compound of stem [bal-] "not" and stem [ʿad] "to, until" as in BHeb. ʿd "to, unto, even to, until", Assy. adi "to, up to, until" (King, 1898: 318), Phoen. ʿd "unto, even to" (PG, 131), Sab. ʿd "to, up to, into, until, etc." (SD, 12), OAram. ʿd "unto, until" (Dupont-Sommer, AG, 5). As for [bal]: Phoen., Pun., EHeb., etc. bl "negation, not" (NWSI I, 165).

In CA the preposition \*ʿad is seen, at least, in two compounds:

(1) ʿattā ~ ḥattā "until, to, in order to, even" (Ṣāhibi, 154) both variants are from \*ʿadtā becoming by assimilation ʿattā or ḥattā, a compound comprising a preposition \*ʿad- "to" and \*t(y) (i.e. tā) "time" (see §2.20.1 above). In SL both /ḥattā/ and /tā/ express an identical meaning and are used interchangeably, but the latter is much more common than the former.

(2) Aram. bl'dy above is semantically identical with CA mā ʿadā. The only difference between them is that CA uses Semitic mā "not" (§3.21.4 below) instead of [bal-].

[bl] above is found in SL in compounds as in the indeclinable *bil ʿasā*, with *bil* from *bi* "by/with" + \*-l- "not" (from CA bal), and ʿasā = "would that (be)!" = CA ʿasā (declinable only in the perfect tense just like *laisā* "is not", i.e. 'not be' (Al ʿAyn II, 200-201). The meaning of the expression is "would that (may) not be" and its exact antonym is *balkā* (pronounced with *Imālah balkā*) "would that (may) be", from *bal* "rather" (CA bal id.) and -kā, the genuine and the unmixed form underlying Proto-Semitic [kwn] "to be". A form -ku, is seen in pre-Islamic Poet. and the Koran as in 'a-ku "I-am", but old Arab grammarians considered it a truncated form of ʿakūnu (§2.21.1.8 below).

**2.20.9** Egyp. pwtry, ptr "who, what" (Gardiner, EG, 566; EHD I, 235) is a compound of Egyp. pw "who, what" (EG, 565) and \*tr-. On the form [tr] Gardiner (EG, §256) writes:

*«tr, sometimes shortened to ty, seems to express surprise or indignation, and may be translated 'forsooth', 'I wonder', or the like. Such examples are, however, exceedingly rare. Tr is common, on the other hand, in questions».*

Egyp. [tr] seems to be linguistically identical with CA form turā, used only in questions. In initial position, it may or may not be preceded by yā "O". In final position, however, it is usually preceded by yā, e.g.

*turā, matā ya ʿtī?* "I wonder, when does he come?  
*matā ya ʿtī yā turā* ~ "When does he come? I wonder".  
*tura, hal Ali hunā?* I wonder, is Ali here?

The word is very much common in SL and many other Arabic dialects, and, to my understanding, it is evidently from raʿā "to see" (§§2.7.11; 2.7.31; 2.17.2, etc. above).

---

with modern Arabic suffixed negative /-iṣ/ as in fī (or fī) "there is": fīṣ "there is not", biʿrif "I know": biʿrif(i)ṣ (< lā ʿaʿrifu ṣay: lā = not"), and so on. In the course of time /mā/ or /lā/ "not" has often been dropped and -(i)ṣ alone has come to convey the negative idea. OʿLeary (1969: §161, n. iii) rightly derives this negative from شَيْء (ṣay) "a thing" above. In actuality, the three forms: *mā fīṣ* ~ *mā fī ṣī* (or *ṣē*) ~ *fīṣ* "there is nothing" are still used interchangeably.

To this proot certainly belongs Egyp. *tr-ti* dual “the two eyeballs of R”.

Moreover, Egyp. *pw-try* = CA *man turā* as in *man turā yakūnu?* “who is he”, lit. “who, I wonder, is he?” (note that *man* alone = “who”). In this position a suffixed personal pronoun is usually attached to *turā*, thus *man turā-hu yakūnu?* “who (‘I wonder of him’ or ‘would that!’) is he?”

**2.20.10** CA *lakin(na)* لَكِنْ ~ *lā kin(na)* لَکِنْ "but, yet; however, nevertheless". Old Arab syntacticists considered the word as consisting of *'inna* plus two extra letters /l-/ and /k-/ , and the two variants *lakin* and *lākinna* as syntactically different (LA). Bin Faris (Ṣāḥibī, 174-175) sees that *lakin(na)* is a compound of *lā* "not" + -k- (i.e. *k-muḥāṭabah*) + *'in* or *'inn*, and that only *lakinna* has the same syntactic function as *'inna* since the noun following it must end in /-a/ (i.e. *manṣūb*), while the noun following its reduced form *lakin* must end in /-u/ (i. e. *marfū* ).

1) There is no doubt that the initial syllable /la-/ or /lā-/ is from *lā* "not", and that /kin/ is cognate with *Akk. akanna* "thus, so", *Phoen., OAram., EHeb. kn*, *BAram. kēn* id., *Syr. hākannā*, *Mand. kin* id. (NWSI I, 517-518, MD, 213), etc. These are related to *BHeb. 'āk* "surely, truly", *'ākēn* id. also "but, yet", *BAram. hkn, hky* (OT, 48; Gray, 1971: §276) = *Eth.: Har. -x* "as to", *Te. -kā* (used esp. *in question*), *Ge. -ke* "now, then", *Te. 'ake* "really", *Tna. 'əkko*, *Amh. əkko*, *Gaf. -ko* (HED, 96), *Sab. t-'k* "thus" (SD, 4), etc.

2) To my understanding, this is the same \*-k- seen in such CA words as *'akkada* “to confirm”; *'akīd* “surely” (§2.7.22 above) and *kalla*, which expresses a very strong negation and prohibition (the Koran: 78: 4, 5; 96: 19; 102: 3, 4, etc.).

**2.20.11** CA *ka'anna* "as if, as though" is a compound of *ka* "as, like" + *'in-* (~ *'inna*) “if”.

1) The word *waika'anna* consists, according to Farāḥīdī and Sibawayhi, of two separate words *wai* and *ka'anna*, but Kisā'i and some other scholars regard the word as a compound of *wai*, -*ka* and *'an*. Some others consider it a compound of *wailu*, -*k*, and *'an*. There is no agreement among old Arab scholars on its signification; some hold that it signifies “don't you see”, some others “be informed, know that”, still others “woe to you”, etc. It occurs in *Poet.* and in the Koran (LA; ṢḤḤ VI, 2556-2557). Of these views, the correct one is that of Farāḥīdī.

2) CA *li'anna* “because” is from *li* “for” and *'an* “that, cause”, while *la'in* consists of *la* (of *confirmation*) and *conditional 'in* “if”.

**2.20.12** Egyp. [n] is a preposition corresponding to Semitic /'n/ and /'l/. It also functions as a *genitive marker*, and seems to correspond here to CA *'al* as the following examples will show:

Egyp. *mw-t* (= mother) *nt* (= of) *ḥmt* (wife) “mother of the wife”

CA *'ummu* (= mother) *'al* (= of) *zauḡah* (wife) “mother of the wife”

Note that CA *'ummu 'al ḥamāt*, as in Egyp., signifies “mother of the wife's mother”.

Egyp. *mw* (= water) *nw* (= of) *yr-t* (= eye) “water of the eye, i.e. *tears*”

CA *mā'u* (= water) *'al* (= of) *'ain* (= eye) “water of the eye, i.e. *tears*”.

Note that CA [ra'-] "seeing" does not derive into a term for "eye", it is seen as /'r/ "eye" only in compounds. This is evidence that the earliest signification of /'r/ is "eye".

**2.20.13** BHeb. 'aḥalēy אַחַלְי, a particle of wishing "O that, would God". Gesenius (OT, 35) writes:

*«It is commonly derived from r. חלה Pi. חלה פנ. "to strike one's face, to caress, to court". But not improb. it may be compounded from אה and לי i.q. לו».*

The particle in question = SL 'āḥ law "O that", a compound of 'āḥ, a particle expressing grief 'ah' = BHeb. 'āḥ id., and law "if": CA law id., Phoen. l, BHeb. lw (PG, 114).

**2.20.14** On Egyp. ḥr, Gardiner (EG §239) writes:

*«old form iḥr indicates what comes next in order, and may be translated "and", "further", or even "accordingly", "so", "then". This particle is probably derived from the verb ḥr "to fall", and the preposition ḥr is obviously closely related... The construction ḥr šdm.f expresses what will be found to happen, what may be anticipated, or the like, and is often best rendered by the English future».*

The older Egyp. form yḥr contains the caus. prefix /'-/ and [ḥr]: cf. yḥr "to make to fall, to bow oneself to the ground" = CA CIV 'aḥarra [r. ḥr] id., as in the Koran (17: 107): (يَخْرُونَ لِلْأَذْقَانِ سَجْدًا), ḥarra "to fall down, bow down" = Egyp. ḥr "to fall down". The verb is different from any other verb expressing "to fall down or kneel down" in that *one usu. falls down or kneels down before a superior or when the name of a superior is mentioned* as in ḥarra (= falls down to the ground) sāḡidan (= kneeling down).

Some of the meanings conveyed by [ḥr] are expressed by ['ḥr] "behind, last, eventually": CA 'āharu (from \*'a'haru) "another, other" also in a sentence "what coming next in order"; 'āhiru, usu. used as adj. "coming after the first"; 'āhira-tu "next (life), i.e. in the future" = Assy. aḥrā-tu fem. pl. "future", Sab. l-'ḥr "henceforth, for the future", ḥr "another time, again", ḥry "after" (SD, 4), BHeb. ḥr with אַחֲרֵי or without it "after that", as adj. "after, following, esp. next following, next, second", e.g. ba-šānā hā'aḥere(h) = CA bi ('a)s-sanati ('a)l 'uḥrā "in the next year, the following year", etc. (OT, 36-37), BAram. ḥr "end, after, other, eventually".

**2.20.15** Egyp. ḥ' "behind, at the back of" from ḥ' "the back of the head, or of the neck", as a vb "to go back, to retreat" (EG, §172) = CA has \*ḥ ~ ḥ signifying "back, head", preserved in many compound trilaterals and quadrilaterals. Some illustrations are:

1) CA danaḥa expresses, according to Aṣma'i (MA, 151) "to bend or bow down the back", but according to Ibin A'rābi (in LA) "to bow down the head" ~ danaḥa also expresses an identical meaning, according to LA. The trilateral is obviously a compound comprising \*[dan-] and \*[ḥ ~ h] "head". The form \*dan- is seen in Sab. \*dn "se soumettre", Ge. danana "s'incliner, baisser les yeux, se soumettre", Tna. dānānā, Te. dānnā, Amh. dānnānā "s'incliner" (DRS IV, 283), CA 'adannu "low-lying" a s in baitun



(= house) *'adannu* and also “hunchbacked” as in *raġulun* (= man) *'adannu*. The same form is also seen in [dnw ~ dny ~ dn'] as in Akk. *dunnū* “se moindre valeur”, Syr. *denā* “se soumettre” (DRS IV, 277), Ug. *dn-t* “baseness” (UG, 530) = CA *danā'a-tu* ~ *danāwa-tu* “baseness, lowliness”, *dana'u* “hump(back), hunch(back)”; *muta-dannī* “low”, Mand. *dnia* “be low, lowly, submissive” (MD, 112).

3) Another root in which \*[ḥ ~ h] is found is the CA quadrilaterals [drbh] and [drbh] as in *darbaḥa*, said of a female pigeon, “to lower her back to its male so that they can mate” and in *darbaḥa*, said of a man, “to lower or bow down the back”. This is from a trilateral [dbh]. If you shift its radicals starting from proot \*-ḥ-, you will get the most common CA term for “hunchbacked, humpbacked” which is *'a-ḥdabu*, as a vb *ḥadiba*.

The /-r-/ of the two variant quadrilaterals is definitely due to dissim., and the original form is CII *dabbaḥa*, where the first /-b-/ dissimilating to /-r-/; cf. CA *dabaḥa* ~ *dabaḥa* “to lower or bow down the head or the back” (= *danaḥa* ~ *danaḥa* in *signification*).

One may note that proot /ḥ~h/ can appear initially or finally without affecting the meaning of the compound. For [dab], see below.

3a) Due to the interchange of /l/ and /r/, CA has created another quadrilateral *dalbaḥa* “to bend or bow down the back”.

The three quadrilaterals are from [dab]. One of the basic meanings of the form in SL as well as in other modern dialects is “to drop” also “to drop, make fall, *from a high place*”, Eth.: Te. *dəb belä* “tomber”, Amh., Gour. *däba* “courbé”, Cush.: Oromo *dabā id.*, Afar *dab* “tomber” (DRS III, 203-205). SL, too, *daba'* also expresses “to fall”, but *it differs from dabb in the loud sound or noise heard as s.t. or s.o. falls on the ground*.

In going back to [dn-ḥ/h] in n. 3 above, we find that it is a compound of \*d- and \*-n. Some of the meanings of CA *dūn* [r. dwn] are “down”, “without”, “behind”, “below”, etc. = Ug. *dnt* “basse qualité”, Min. *b-dwn* “sans” (= CA *bidūn* ~ *dūn id.*), etc. (DRS IV, 237), etc.

3b) CA [dwn] also expresses another basic meaning “near to, close to” as in *dūn id.*, *danā* “be near, nigh; draw near, approach”; *daniy* “near”, etc., OffAram., Palm. *dny* “to approach” (NWSI I, 256), Syr. *denā* “s'approcher de”, SA: Soq., Meh. *dinye*, Jib. *dini* “monde” = CA *dunyā id.* and is definitely derived from notion “near”: comp. CA *'as-sama'u 'ad-dunyā* “the sky of our world”, i.e. *the closest to us as distinguished from other skies* (LA). Cf. Akk. *daninu* “monde d'en dessous”.

It does not surprise me to find some Semitic languages expressing the notion “sunrise” with [dnḥ] as in OffAram., Jp., Syr. *dnḥ*, Mand. *dnia*, *dniha* “se lever (soleil), resplendir, apparaître” (DRS IV, 282). It seems that the trilateral is a compound of \*dn- “be near, be nigh” and \*-ḥ- “sun”, and its original meaning is “sunrise is near or nigh”.

4) CA *rukḥu* “side, edge (of anything)”, but we have dozens of other words expressing this very same notion like *ṭarafu*, *ġānibu*, *ḥāfa-tu*, *ḥarfū*, and so forth. The differences among them are very slight and lie either in use, application, or shade of meaning.

In *Hadith*: «*lā šuf'ata fī finā'in wa lā ṭarīḳin wa lā rukḥin*», where *rukḥ* “side of a house from behind, *at the back*”. The inst. *mirkāḥu* “saddle placed at the rear part of a horseback” also “sitting on the hind part of a horseback” (AL 'Ayn III, 62; LA): *rakā* “to lean on”.

7) CA *ḳamaḥa* “to raise the head”: *ḳamma* “to ascend”.

8) Another example may be CVI *tafāḳaḥa* “to meet back to back” is the exact antonym of CVI *taḳābala* “to meet face to face”; *faḳḥa-tu* “anus” (SHH I, 392). However, if you shift the order of *ta-fāḳaḥa* to *ta-kāfaḥa*, you will get a new trilateral [kḥḥ] = “meet face to face”.

9) Egyp. n ḥ’ signifies “behind” and “about” = CA *naḥw* “about” as in *naḥwa ‘ašrati riḡālin* “about ten men”, *baḳiya naḥwa sā’atin* “he stayed about an hour”, etc.; *nāḥiyatu* “side”; *naḥḥa* “to push aside”; *tanaḥḥa* “to turn away from, withdraw from, to cede” (§2.2.51 above). It seems to me that most CA triliterals containing \*-ḥ “back, behind” have lost this meaning and come to mean “side” in general (e.g. *kwḥ*, *ḏrḥ*, etc.).

**2.20.16** Egyp. *ḏr*, «*derived from a stem meaning ‘end’, signifies ‘since’*» (Gardiner, EG, §176) = CA *ḏarīr* “side, edge, end (usu. of a valley)” as in Poet. (Awas Bin Haḡar):

«...yarmī (’a)ḏ *ḏarīra* biḥuṣbi (’a)ṯ ṯalḥi wa (’a)l bāni».

1) Egyp. *ḏr* also signifies “to be near the limit or boundary, by the side of something, near” (EHD II, 908) = CA CIV *’adarra* [ḏr] id. as in Poet. (Abdalla Bin Atmah):

«...ḡadāta *’adḏarra* bi (’a)l ḥasani (’a)s sabīlu» (LA).

The difference in meaning between [ḏr] and other terms for “near; draw near” is that it is “draw near s.t. from all sides, as *fog does with the earth*”.

2) It is interesting to find Egyp. *ḏr-t* expressing “palm of the hand” (EHD II, 908), while its CA cognate *ḏarra-tu* expresses *the same meaning but with a different application*. It applies to *the foot*, hence “sole of the foot”: (see r. ḡl).

3) To the proot under consideration belongs Egyp. *ḏrw* “rump”; *ḏrḏrwī* “rump, buttocks” (EHD II, 909) = CA *ḏarratāni* dual id.

4) Egyp. *ḏrī* “hard, firm” (EG, 604) = CA *ḏarīru* “strong, tough”. As for Egyp. *ḏr* “all, the whole” (EHD II, 908) = perh. CA *ṯurr-an* id.

**2.20.17** Egyp. *yn* “indeed”, also used to emphasize a noun as in *yn sš X sphr snn fnn* lit. “Verily the scribe X was the one who copied this writing” (EG, §227) = CA *’inna* “indeed”, also used for emphasis or confirmation before a noun or pronoun, and becomes *’an* before a verb or particle as in the Koran: *’inna-ka maiyitun wa ’inna-hum maiyitun* = lit. “Verily thou wilt die and verily they will die” (39: 30), *ḡul ’inna ’al ’amra kullahu lillahi*, lit. Say (to them): *verily the authority rests wholly with God* (3: 153), Mand. *’in* “yes, behold, O, indeed”, Syr. *’n*, Heb. *hēn* (MD, 348).

**2.20.18** Egyp. /r/ originally /ṛ/ whose original signification, according to Gardiner (EG §163), is “to, toward” = Semitic *’ilā* id. Some of its usages in Egyp. and Semitic are:

1. *of place*. As in *r the West, heaven, home* “to or toward the West, heaven, home” = CA *’ilā ~ li the West, heaven, home* id.: /li/ is a reduced form of *’ilā*.

2. *of purpose*. As in Egyp. *r m* “to what purpose” = CA *li mā* id. and Egyp. *r šhrt ḥftyw-f* “in order to overthrow his enemies” = CA *li naṯīḥ bi ’a’dā’i-hi* “in order to (we) overthrow his enemies”.

3. *of time*. As in Egyp. *r nw* “at the (right) time”, *r hrw 4* “for (extending over) four days” = CA *li (’a)t (= this) taw (= time)* “at this time”. This /li/ is referred to by old Arab

grammarians as «*lām Al waḳt* », i.e. /l/ *of time*, as in the PIP of Nābiyah:

«tawahhamtu 'āyātin lahā fa 'araftuhā

*li-sittati 'a'wāmin wa ḏā ('a)l 'āmu sābi'u*», where *li-* signifies “for or extending over” (for additional examples, see Tha‘ālibi’s FL, p. 324 and LA r. lwm).

4) It is used *with the infinitive* in Egyp. to express the following notions:

4a) *of comparison*. As in Egyp. *stomach too heavy r wnm* “to eat” = CA uses /l/ with the imperfect as in *stomach too heavy li 'a'kulu* “to eat” (no infinitive in CA: see §2.1.7.3, ft. 1).

4b) As shown above in §2.19.3, n. 3 above), both Egyp. and CA /r/ expresses ‘*more than*’. The question rises here: is there any historical relationship between CA comparative suffix /-r/ and its superlative prefix /l-/.

**2.20.19** OffAram. 'pyty is, according to NWSI I, 95, «adv. or adj.?, meaning unknown poss. *immediately* (derivation from Akk. ?)». The word is a compound of \*py + \*-ty, perh. = SL *fī-t-taw* or *tauwan* = “right off” also “immediately, directly”. The first /-t-/ is from /'l/ “the” by assim., *taw* = “time”, while final /-an/ of *tauwan* is *an adverbial ending*. The adv. *taw-* is seen in CA in a sentence like *sāfara* (= he traveled) *tauw-an* (= directly, i.e. *with no stop or halt anywhere*) *'ilā* (= to): cf. ML I, 341; or in a phrase like *fī 'at* (= the) *taw* “immediately”.

## 2.21 PHS NEGATIVES

Information gathered from Hamito-Semitic language divisions shows that PHS had a large number of negative elements. It seems reasonable to assume that PHS usage of negatives in an utterance mirrors that of CA in the sense that one may use more than one negative to strengthen or emphasize the idea of negation. An example from CA illustrating this use may be *lā wa lan 'arāhu 'abadan* “I + not + will never + see him + never”. To make the negation even stronger, a fourth compound negative *muṭlaḳan* or *bilmuṭlaḳ* “absolutely not” may also be added after ‘*'abadan*’<sup>247</sup>. The following list of negatives is limited only to those found in Hamito-Semitic as an inseparable part of the root in some or all of their occurrences:

- a) '(y),
- b) l(') ~ 'l,
- c) ('n ~ n(') ~ nn
- d) m,
- e) bW,
- f) t,
- g) d.

There are still other negatives found, esp. in Egyp. and CA. For example, Egyp. [bn ~ bny] “not” (= Leb., esp. SL bnawb “never”), tm “not, nought, nothing, by no means, not any, non” as in *tm rd* “not to permit or allow” (EG, §§342; 347-350), [w], described by Gardiner (EG, §352) as «*ancient and exceedingly rare word for “not”, which is placed after the šdm-f form in prohibitions*», [nfr], esp. in combination with [n] and [pw] (EG, §351).

CA [midd] *arch.* “no” (it is rather a mild negative), *dūn* or *bi-dūn* “without”, *lam* “did not”, *lan* “will never”, *laysa* “is not”, *kalla* “(strong) no” (Koran 102: 4, 5; 104: 4, etc.), etc. All such negatives are compounds. For compounds *lam* & *lan*, see §2.22 below, and for *laisa*, see §2.21.2.1 below.

### 2.21.1 PHS NEGATIVE '(y)

Akk. *aya* “not” (AG, 68), Phoen. 'y “reversive” (PG, 76), CA 'a-, the so-called سلبية negative /'a/, or, according to LA (see r. ḥfr) *hamzat al izālah*, Eth. 'ē, 'ī, Tig. 'ay (O’Leary *ibid*), Assy. ē, ai, BHeb. 'ī (King, 1898: 317, 327). This negative is also found

<sup>247</sup> It is important to note that the use of a number of negatives in a sentence has nothing to do with the meaning, and thus negatives cannot destroy one another as in modern English (but not in MSA and dialects). This is, in fact, the situation which was common in English before the 18th century. Consider the following example from Old English: *Hē ne huntēþ nāfre nān þing* “He does not hunt never nothing”.

as part of the root in Semitic, and we have already examined many of such roots. Some additional examples are:

The full form [ʾiy], used for prohibition, is preserved in CA as a bound morpheme prefixed to a personal pronoun like -ka “you (masc.)” as in ʾiyyā-ka “Don’t you ever”. This must be clearly distinguished from its homophone ʾiyyā, called, *a particle of particularization* (Ṣaḥībi, p. 142), as in ʾiyyā-ka “you (only/alone)”. Examples from the Koran are: (إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَإِيَّاكَ نَسْتَعِينُ), *Thee (alone) we worship and Thee (only) we seek help* (1: 5), (مَا كُنْتُمْ إِيَّانَا تَعْبُدُونَ), *It was not us that you worshipped* (10: 28)<sup>248</sup>.

A reduced form of this negative /ʾa-/ is seen in false CIV verbs, and one has to differentiate between true CIV and false or negative CIV, both have the same spelling and pronunciation, but differ in meaning, as in CIV ʾafraḥa “make happy, gladden”, which is true CIV since it is formed by prefixing caus. ʾa- to the ground-stem fariḥa “be happy, glad” (cf. §2.3 above), while it homophonous ʾafraḥa signifies “make unhappy, sadden” and is therefore the false CIV since it is formed from fariḥa by prefixing the negative ʾa-

Another example is CA sarra, CIV caus. ʾasarra “to keep secret, cover or hide something” and ʾasarra “to manifest, disclose, show”; both occurred in the Koran (10:54 and 16: 19)<sup>249</sup>.

**2.21.1.1** Akk. ablu “dry”, Heb. ʾābēl “to wither” (Rabin, 1975: 87, n. 20) is perh. from bal- “wet, moist” (see §§2.3.21 & 2.12.50 above).

**2.21.1.2** BHeb. ʾēšel “to separate, put aside” (OT, 82) is the opposite of CA waṣala “to connect”; CIV ʾawṣala, etc. (see §3.12.1 above). If you want to express the opposite meaning of waṣala, use faṣala “to disconnect, to separate, set apart, etc.”. In accordance with this fact, [fa] must be among the list of negatives as variant of [bW].

**2.21.1.3** BHeb. ʾōn [r. ʾwn] “strength”, Ug. ʾan “strength” (OT, 23f, DRS I, 12), OffAram. ʾwn “force” (NWSI I, 23): CA wanā “physical weakness”.

**2.21.1.4** The trilateral [ʾby] expresses in BHeb. ʾābā(h) “be willing, inclining, to desire”, OAram. htn-ʾbw “be envious”, OffAram. ʾby “be willing, to desire”, but in CA ʾabā “be unwilling, to refuse, spurn, hate or loathe” as in the PIP of Amr Bin kalthum:

«ʾiḏā mā ʾalmulku sāma (ʾa)n nāsa ḥasfan

ʾabīnā ʾan nuḳirra (ʾa)l ḥasfa fīnā» (ŠM, p. 347, L. 113).

Min. st-ʾby “to refuse” (= CA CX ʾistaʾbā), and Ge. ʾabaya “be unwilling, to refuse”, etc. (DRS I, 3; OT, 4; LA, r. ʾby).

<sup>248</sup> The real signification of this /ʾiy/ seems to be ‘only, lone’.

<sup>249</sup> It is possible that this negative particle is ultimately related to [ʾiy] as in CA ʾiy “yes” (the Koran 10:53), = Ug. ʾi “vraiment!, En vérité!”, Akk. i “Eh bien! allons” (DRS I, 16). SL (and all modern dialects) ʾē “yes, certainly”, the full form of ʾē in all modern Arabic dialects is ʾaywa “yes; certainly” = Egyp. ʾwī “certainly” (EHD I, 30), Ge., Te., Tna. ʾəwa “yes”, Amh. awa, Soq. ewa (Cohen ibid.), Har. ī “yes”, Cush.: Ga. ī “yes, certainly” (HED, 17).

«Une hypothèse pour expliquer les deux valeurs contradictoires de la rac. est que. signifiant “vouloir” et s’employant presque toujours suivie d’une négation (“vouloir que... ne pas”), le v. a fini par prendre le sens de “ne pas vouloir que”. Ainsi, si en ar. classique *’abā* a le sens de “ne pas vouloir”, dans les dialectes modernes d’Arabie et du Maghrib, il a gardé le sens de “vouloir”... L’hypothèse a été combattue par BSS 66, qui estime que h. *’ābā* avait pour sens primitif “ne pas vouloir”, et soutenue par GVG 2/179» (Cohen *ibid.*).

a) The data set forth above uncover two different origins of \*’a-: (a) caus. *’a* (§2.3 above) in BHeb., Aram., and possibly phoen., and (b) neg. \*’- in CA, SA, and Eth.

b) CA *bā’a* denotes “to admit, to confess” as in the PIP of Labid:

«’ankar-tu *bā’ilahā* wa **bu’**-tu bi-ḥaḳḳihā...» (DL, p. 178, line 1).

The original meaning of CA, SA, and Eth. [’by] seems to have been “not to care for” > “to refuse, reject, hate, be unwilling”. Such derived meanings can be expressed by BHeb. *’ābā* when preceded by the negative *lō*.

A related root is seen in CA *arch.* *wabaha*, used *only* when preceded by neg. *lā*, “to care for” (SHH VI, 2054). This verb has rarely been used even in the Classical period, and the most commonly used forms have always been *lā ya-’bahu* and *lā yu-bālī* “he (= yu-) does not (= *lā*) care”. Note that *perf.* *’abiha* (~ *wabaha*) is rarely used and does not share with *bāla* “care for”; *bālu* “mind” the same ultimate root.

c) *Is it possible to trace CA [-baW] to a root [baW] signifying “hate” as in Egyp. bw id.?*

**2.21.1.5** Akk. *apāru* “to cover”, etc.: CA *farra* “to uncover” (see §§2.3.13 above)<sup>250</sup>.

**2.21.1.6** CA *’amiha* “to forget” from *’amahu* “forgetfulness”, Egyp. *mhí* “to forget”: *m’w* “remember”, etc. see §§2.3.6-2.3.8 above. This is the very same /-h/ seen in *sahw* “forgetfulness, inattention”; *sahā* “forget, lose memory of” (see §2.11.30 above).

## 2.21.2 PHS NEGATIVE *l(’-)* “no, not”

Akk., CA *lā*, Ug. *l*, BHeb. *lō(’)* (Rabin, 1975: 88), OAram. *l’* (Rosenthal, AG, 11),

<sup>250</sup> Some other illustrative examples are:

a) CA *nabiha* “to remember”, false CIV *’anbaha* “to forget” (MA, 385; LA, r. nbh).

CA *’arġa’a* “to adjourn, put off, postpone (doing s.t. until some other time)” and *’arġa’a* “be about to do, be near to (used only in the context of time)” (Anbāri, Kitāb Al Addād, n. 349).

b) CA *tariba* “to become poor”: *’atraba* “to become rich” (Sāhibi, p. 104), traditionally derived from *turābu* “soil”.

c) CA *ḥafara* “to protect and shelter”, while false CIV *’ahfara* expresses the opposite meaning.

d) CA *ḥafā* “to hide, cover”, true IV *’ahfā* “to hide, cover”, Syr. *ḥipā* id., BHeb. *ḥāpā* “to cover, veil” (OT, 333), OffAram. *ḥpy* “covering” (NWSI I, 394): CA false CIV *’ahfā* “to uncover, reveal, disclose”.

Berb. as in Shil. la (Applegate, 1958: 58), ESA: Min. l' (Beeston, 1962: 66). SL the form is /la'/ and in emphasis /la''a/. It is not unreasonable to assume that \*l' is a compound of two negatives \*l- and \*-', and that the loss of \*' caused the lengthening of the preceding vowel in Akk. and CA. PHS \*l-, like \*m-, is part of the Semitic trilateral root in some of its occurrences.

A similar negative morpheme is \*l, which seems to be based on \*l', as in Akk. ul, CA, Ug., BHeb., BAram. 'al, Phoen. 'l, OAram. 'l (DRS I, 19), Sab., Qat., Had. 'l (Beeston, 1962: 66), Ge. 'al, Har. -al, Amh., S., W., Z. al (HED, 24). It is also seen as part of the trilateral. Some illustrative examples are:

**2.21.2.1** CA *laisa* lit. "not is" used as an element of negation as in *las-na waḥdanā* "we are not alone", *lais-at ḡamilatan* "she is not beautiful", *las-ta mu'alliman* "you are not a teacher", etc. This is a compound of negative /lā-/ "not" and root \*-isa- from [ʾys] "to be" (LA, r. 'ys, ML I, 164). The root [ʾys] and the compound /laisa/ are both preserved in this proverb: «جئ به من أيس وليس» (phonemic transcription) /gi' bihi min 'aisa wa laisa/ "fetch him from (wherever) he (may) be (= 'aisa) and (may) not be (= laisa)" (cf. LA *ibid.*). Another common proverb in which we find the original word is «أيس من ليس لا يعرف», lit. *he does not know what is (= 'aysa) from what is not (= laysa)*<sup>251</sup>. LA states that /'ais/, like /ḥaiθ/ below, denotes "existence, being", hence when we say: *lā 'ais* we mean "not exist, not be".

Farāhīdī states that «*laisa* is from *lā 'aysa* "not be", then /'/' was dropped (for ease of pronunciation) and /'/' annexed to /y/. Evidence supporting what we say is: 'i'tinī (= bring to me!) *bi-hi* (= with-him) *min* (= from) *ḥaiθu* (= where) 'aisa (= he is) *wa* (and) *laisa* (he is not)» (Al 'ayn VII, 300; LA *ibid.*; ML *ibid.*).

The compound is not confined to CA but found in some other Semitic languages as in OAram. lyš "(there) is not", and with heretofore unexplained /t/ for /š/: OffAram, Palm. lyt, JAram. l'yty "(there) is not": comp. OAram. 'yty, BAram., OffAram. 'yt, "there is; existence", JAram., Nab., 'yt, Mand. 'it, Syr. 'īt, Palm. 'yt id. Gray (1971:§282) derives Aram. [ʾyt] from [ʾyš] and ascribes the change «*by analogy with layt "is not"*», forgetting that -t of /layt/ itself cries for explanation. Cohen (*ibid.*) derives all of them, including Ug. [ʾθ] below, from \*ʾys/θ. The only explanation for /t/ in the Aramaic forms is that it has developed from an original /θ/. For this /θ/, see /'wθ/ in §2.21.5.1 below.

The compound is also found in Assy. laššu "there is not": comp. Assy. išu "to be", Akk. išu "to be, to have", BHeb. yēš "exist" (DRS I, 18, NWSI I, 576; MD, 348; Albright, JAOS 47, p. 207, n. 7). The trilateral \*ʾyš is also seen in personal names as in Bab. *i-ši-ba'al* "Ba'al exists" = BHeb. 'ēšba'al id., but not Aram. 'ytybl, 'ayty'l as Shehadeh (1968: 179-180) assumes.

**2.21.2.2** Akk. almattu (\*alman-tu) fem. "widow", pl. almanāti, Ug. 'lmnt, Phoen. 'lmt,

<sup>251</sup> CA 'ais- "to be" has a variant /'aiš-/ seen in a fixed expression. Another root having to do with a similar notion is 'āda signifies "to become" (rarely used in modern times and the widely used form is šāra) and also "to (go and) come back": comp. sāra "to walk, move".

BHeb. 'almānā id. (DRS I, 21), OAram. 'rmlt, CA 'armala-tu fem. (by distant dissim.) “widow” (Rosenthal, AG, 9): PSem. \*'al-man-tu, fem. “widow”, a compound of two elements: ['al] “lacking, deprived of, no(t)” as in Akk. ul, CA, BHeb. 'al, Phoen., Ug. 'l “not” (Gray, 1971: §283); [man] “man (as a protector)”’: see §2.17.61 above.

**2.21.2.3** CA lā'ibu “thirsty”, lāba “be thirsty”, laubu “thirst”, lūbu, said of camels, “thirsty and far away from water”, is a compound of \*-l- “no, not” and \*'abu- “water” as in CA 'abābu id., Akk. abūbu “flood, inundation”, Ge. 'ababi “flood, wave”, etc. (§2.2.22, esp. n. b above). Accordingly, the original meaning of the compound may be “no water”.

**2.21.2.4** BHeb., Syr. lā'az “to speak in a barbarous or foreign tongue” (OT, 524) = CA layaza “to equivocate, speak in riddles”: CA yazā “to mean (in an explicit and straightforward way)”; mayzā “meaning, signification”.

**2.21.2.5** CA lasa'a “to stay home and not leave (anywhere)” is a compound of \*l “no, not” and sa'a “to go out” also in the Koran (20: 15) “work and gain”. The original meaning of the root is [not + go out] or [not + (go out to) work and gain], i.e. *stay home*.

**2.21.1.8** Eth. 'akkō “is not” is from \*alkō, consisting of \*'al- “not” and \*kō (Gray, 1971; O'Leary, 1969: 80). The word \*kō may be traced to [kwn] “be”. In accordance with this view, the original meaning of the compound is “not be, i.e. *there is no*”, with \*kō being a reduced form of Semitic \*kwn “to be”. My view on this word has been influenced by the compound /mā-kō/ in Iraqi dial. “there is no” (e.g. *mā-kō flūs* “there is no money” lit. *not exist money* = SL *mā-ft flūs* id.), mā = CA mā “no, not”, and kō = CA kū, ku “be”, the reduced form of kāna “be”, which was of frequent use in both the Koran and pre-Islamic Poetry. An example from the Koran is 'aku as in (ولم أك بغيا), *nor was I unchaste* (19: 20), where 'aku “I am” ('a = “I” and ku “be”), and from PIP, e.g. Nabīyah says:

«fā'in 'a-ku maḏlūman...wa 'in ta-**ku**...», where 'a-ku = “I am” and ta-ku “you are” (ta “you masc. sg.” and ku “are”), etc.

**2.21.2.6** CA mu-ṭahhamu sounds like superl. and is said of *man, horse*, etc. “perfect or utmost degree of beauty” > ṭahmalu “ugly” (IV, 124): ṭaḥṭāhu [r. ṭh] “wonderful young, as a horse” (Al 'Ayn III, 346). *Is /-l/ here a suffixed negative?*

### 2.21.3 PHS NEGATIVE ('n-

HEgy. *n, nn, n', nt* (HED I, 339, 341; EG, 572), Cush.: Ga. *anne* (HED, 27), Akk. *yānu, ya'nu*, Ug. 'in, Moab., Pun. 'n, CA 'in, Eth. 'en, BHeb. 'ēyn (DRS I, 24; O'Leary ibid; NWSI I, 46). In CA the form may appear as 'in (Al 'ayn VIII, 396), 'inī(h) or as a suffix -ni(h), i.e. *a post negative particle* like Egyp. *yn* id. (LA, roots, 'nn and 'ny). It seems that Semitic /'n/ is a compound of two negatives [\*' - and \*-n-], used to strengthen the idea of negation. The negative \*n is generally seen in Semitic languages as part of



the root. In CA, it is part of the root in many of its occurrences.

**2.21.3.1** CA *naḥūšu*, said of a she-ass, "producing no milk" (MA, 286) also in PIP "wild she-ass" and could also refer to "wild cow", perh. because a *wild she-ass* or *wild cow* could be 'white' as in Poet.:

«...yalma'na 'iḏ walaiyna bi ('i)l 'aṣā'iṣi».

The verb *yalma'na*, whose subject is *naḥā'iṣu* pl. of *nuḥūšu*, implies that their color is *intensely white* (LA). The word for "no milk" is a compound of \*n- "not" and \*ḥṣ (from \*ḥḍ) "milk" = Egyp. ḥḍ id., while the word for "wild she-ass, wild cow" is based on \*ḥḍ "white" = Egyp. ḥḍ "white, bright" (EG, 583) also "white oxen; white goose", etc. as a vb "to become bright, to become light"; ḥḍwt "light, radiance, splendor" (EHD I, 522-523) = CA ḥaḍa'a "to flame up a fire, make a fire burn" (also ḥaḍaba, ḥaḍaḡa, etc.).

**2.21.3.2** EHeb., OffAram. nṣl "to retake, take (away), remove" (NWSI, II.), CA naṣala "take away, remove"; ta-naṣṣala "get rid of, free oneself from" < waṣala "to connect, join, attach" (thus, *Not remove*); wāṣala "to continue with, be in touch with" (thus, *Not get rid of or free oneself from*); 'awṣala "to deliver to, make arrive at" (thus, *Not take away* (from)); \*'awṣala "to give": ṣila-tu "gift" (thus, *Not take*).

1) As has already been mentioned in §2.12.1 above, /-l/ is a proot. Additional evidence supporting this fact is that one can say: faṣaṣ-tu-hu, CVIII 'i-fṣaṣ-tu-hu [r. fṣ] "I separated it/him from" or faṣal-tu-hu id.; CVII 'infaṣṣa ~ CVII 'infaṣā [r. fṣy] ~ CVII 'infaṣala "be separated". The radical /f-/ = "apart", /-ṣ-/ (from earlier /-ḍ-/ ) = "tie". Moreover, CA maṣṣilu "joint" seems to be from notion of "separate, divide" and its original meaning is "place of separation between bones". In other Semitic languages the same idea can be expressed by [wṣl]. In CA, too, the cognate exists and is used only in pl. 'awṣālu "joints". Here the word is derived, just like its cognates, from "join, connect". For what concerns final /-l-/ here, one can also drop it and use faṣṣu "joint", pl. fuṣūšu.

**2.21.3.3** CA nafā "to deny, say no" is a compound of \*na- "no" and fāha "to utter, say", from \*pw- "mouth" in CA pū(h), Assy. pū "mouth", Ug. p id., etc.

**2.21.3.4** CA naṣata "not to emit a sound, remain silent, listen" (cf. Koran 7: 204, 46: 29), Sab. nṣt "be silent" (SD, 100), Tham. nṣt "listen" (Branden, 1950: 519) = CA CIV 'anṣata id. All are from a compound containing a negative prefix \*n- and a word \*ṣawt-. The word has become a root in HS languages as in CA ṣāta [ṣwt] "emit a sound" CII ṣauwata "to shout" (in MSA and dialects also "to vote"); ṣautu "sound, voice", Ge. ṣwt "to shout", Chad.: Sura, Angas sat, Chip sət "to speak" (HSED, n. 425).

HS [ṣawt-] is from \*ṣaw- (or \*ṣa'-) as in CA ṣā'a "emit a sound, chirp, as a small bird, to cry out, to shout", ṣa'ṣa'a "to emit a sound" (SL ṣawṣā "to emit a sound, chirp"), ṣuwwa-tu "voice, echo", Sab. ṣwy "to inform" (SD, 146), OffAram. ṣwy "to command". For the semantic relationship between "speak" and "command": cf. CA 'mr "command" but in OArām., BHeb., etc. 'mr "speak" (§2.3.7 above). The same proot is also seen in §2.17.16 above. For [-t], see §2.9 above.

To the proot *ṣw* belong Har. *ṣāṣu* "chick"; *ṣīṣī bāya* "twitter", Tna., Amh., Arg. *ṣāṣut* "chick", Tna. *ṣāwṣāw bālā* "clamour, shout", Te. *ṣuṣu* "chick"; *ṣiwṣiw bela* "twitter", Amh. *tān-ṣaṣṣa id.*, Cush.: Ga. *ṣaṣu*, Qab. *ṣuwṣuwēta*, Sid. *ṣāṣute* "chick", etc., (HED, 50).

I expect many traditional trilaterals expressing "utter a sound, shout, speak, twitter, chirp, a kind of bird, and the like" to have developed from *\*ṣaw-* (i.e. *ḍaw*). We have already dealt with HS compound [ṣpr] "whistle" also "a kind of bird". We may add Chad.: Tangale seer, Bolewa sor-, seer, Bolewa sor- "to speak" (HSED, n. 433), Cush.: Housa *ṣiryā* "parakeet", Cush.: Oromo *ṣirii* "kind of bird", Ometo *ṣeraa* "bird", Eyp. *ḍry-t* "kite", Te. *ṣir* "bird", Amh. *ṣere id.* (HSED, n. 443). Also, CA *ḍauwatu* "sound and clamor", *ḍa'ḍā' ~ ḍawḍā'* "noises (sounds) of people"; *ḍu'ḍu'* "a kind of bird", etc.

**2.21.3.5** CA *naḵaḍa*, said of a vow, promise, etc. "to break" < *ḵaḍā*, said of a vow, promise, etc. "to fulfill, accomplish".

**2.21.3.6** CA *\*-ḡri* most likely means "sun" in this proverb «*mina 'al faḡri 'ila 'an naḡri*», *mina* (= from) *'al* (= the) *faḡri* (= dawn) *'ila* (= to) *'an* (< *'al* = the) *naḡri* (= sunset), i.e. *all the daylight long*. The word *\*-ḡri* occurs twice in the proverb: *faḡri* and *naḡri*. The word /*faḡru*/ (-u = nom. case) is one of the common Arabic terms for "dawn", whereas /*naḡru*/ does not mean "sun". The trilateral [nḡr] has the following meanings: *naḡara* "to heat"; *naḡru* "thirst and excess of drinking, heat"; *nāḡiru* and *'āḡiru* are *pre-Islamic names of the two hottest months of the summer*. It seems that *naḡru*, *nāḡiru* [r. nḡr], *faḡru* and *'āḡiru* are all based on a stem *\*ḡār-* "sun, light, heat" as in CA *ḡāriya-tu* "sun, heat, light", and with prefixed h-, CA *haḡīru*, *haḡru* "half of the daylight, year", etc. see §2.4.16 above.

1) *naḡru* (in the proverb) consists of *\*n* "not, no" or more likely "down" and stem *\*ḡār-* "sun" and its original meaning is either "no sun" or "sunset", i.e. the sun (is) down.

2) *faḡru* (in the proverb) consists of *\*f-*, more likely from *\*pā-* "rise > shine" or less likely "coming back again, returning to its usual course" (§2.17.14 above), and *\*ḡār* "sun" as in *ḡāriya-tu fem. id.*

**2.21.3.7** Pun. *nšl* "to fall" (NWSI, II, 765) = SL *našal* [r. *nšl*] "to lift anything from a low place, as a pit or well" ~ *šāl* "to lift": CA *šāla* "to lift, raise".

**2.21.3.8** Sab. *nt'* "to rebel, raise an insurrection": CA *ṭā'a*, CIV *'aṭā'a* "to obey, be obedient, submissive, yield to the wishes or commands of".

**2.21.3.9** CA *nabā* "to disagree with, oppose" contains *\*n-* "not" (see §2.21.1.4 above).

**2.21.3.10** CA *ḡi' ḡi'* "(call on or order) camels to drink" > *ḡa'ḡa'a* "to call on camels to drink". The trilateral [nḡḡ] in *naḡnaḡa* expresses the opposite meaning as in the PIP of Thu Rummah:

«ḡattā 'iḍā lam yaḡid waylan wa *naḡnaḡa-hā...*» (LA).

**2.21.3.11** CA *naḏā* “dry up + water”, i.e. “no water”, while in the fixed expression: *ya-naḏā lahu* ‘al *ġabīn* “to sweat”, i.e. *secrete little amount of water* = [naḏ] in §2.11.64 above. Proot [n-] here expresses “little, small” and is also seen in *naḏaba* “drain (said of water), dry up”

CA *naḏaba* “to drain (water), flow off” is a compound containing a word \*ḏab- “to flow” and “water” (see §2.3.34 n. d) and a negative prefix \*-n-: cf. CA *ḏabba*, BHeb. *ṣābab* “to flow”, etc.

**2.21.3.12** Egyp. *nmḥw* “poor man, orphan”: *nmḥ* “be poor” (EHD I, 375) is a compound of neg. [n] and stem *mḥ* “to fill full, full”; *mḥ-t* “abundance” (EHD I, 316).

#### 2.21.4 PHS NEGATIVE *m* “no, not”

CA *mā*, Eth. -*m* (O’Leary, 1969: §161), Har. *mē* (Leslau, EHD, 102), Egyp. *m* (EHD I: 266), Berb. as in Shil. *ma* (Applegate, 1958: 60), Cush. as in Som. *mayā* (Kirk, 1905: 211).

**2.21.4.1** BHeb. *mā’ēn* “to refuse; unwilling, refusing”, Eth. *m’n* “to refuse” (Ryder, 1974: 131; OT, 531): CA *’inna* “yes (agreeing)”. LA reports that Ibin Zubair said in a conversation with Fāḏalah Bin Sharik: «... *’inna wa rākibuhā*», *yes and its rider* (also see Al ‘Ayn VIII, 398). BHeb-Eth. word corresponds neatly to a phrase in SL: *mā ’ann* “(he) did not agree”, i.e. *did not say yes, he refused*, including *mā* “not”. Another example, *mā* (= not) *kān* (= he was) *y-’enn* (he says yes, i.e. *agrees*) id., i.e. *he was unwilling, he refused to agree*.

**2.21.4.2** CA *maṣaḥa* “to perish, decay”, said of a flower “to wither, fade away“, said of a dress, “be worn out”, said of a book, lit. “be obliterated”, i.e. *be erased, unreadable*, is perh. from *ṣaḥḥu* “healthy, sound”; *ṣaḥḥa* “to regain health, be healthy; sound, whole” (see §§2.11.37, 2.12.24, etc. above).

**2.21.4.3** A very interesting linguistic phenomenon of semantic change is furnished by CA [mlḵ] as in CIV *’amlāḡa*, caus., “to be or become poor” which is a compound of negative [m-] and stem [laḡ-] “to take, seize” (for this stem, see §2.10.2 above). This analysis of [mlḵ] is based on the special type of ‘poverty’ the trilateral denotes. LA [r. mlḵ] states:

«The original meaning of *’imlāḡu* (i.e. poverty) is *’infāḡu* (i.e. expenditure). It is said (that someone) *’amlāḡa* (= he spends) what he possesses (of money). If one spends all what he has in the hand and does not hold it tightly, (he will) eventually become poor».

LA concludes: «people use (here) the cause of poverty (i.e. spending what one possesses) to denote poverty itself». It seems evident that the original meaning of [mlḵ] is “not seize (money)” = “spend (money)”

**2.21.4.5** OAram. *šwm* “to fast” (Rosenthal, AG, 13), OffAram. *šwm* id. (NWSI II, 965), BHeb. *šūm* “to fast”; *šōm* “fast”, CA *šāma* “to fast”. A closely related trilateral is [*šmt*] as in BHeb. *šāmat* “be silent” (OT, 898), CA *šamtu* “silence”; *šamata* “be silent”. A variant trilateral [*zmt*] exists in CA (ML III, 23). All are based on [*šaW*] < [*daW*] (§2.21.3.4 above), and the function or meaning of /-m-/ is difficult to determine with certainty.

### 2.21.5 PHS NEGATIVE *b* “un-, not”

PHS \**bW-*, seen in Egyp. *bw* “not, no” as in *bw* ‘*n* “unpleasant, ungracious” (‘*n* “pleasant, gracious”), *bw yr* “do not” (*yr* “to do”): cf. EHD I, 213f. It is also seen in Egyp. as an inseparable part of the root (§2.21.5.5 below), Cush. \**ba* “not have”, Chad. \**ba*, *a negative marker* (Ehret, 1995, n. 2). The neg. is found in CA as part of the root. It should be stressed that if this negative is originally \**b* “without”, then it will be from [*b-*] as in Sem. *bi* “with” and [*-*] “not”.

**2.21.5.1** Ug. ‘*θ* is from \*‘*wθ* “to exist”, CA \*['*wθ ~'yθ*] “to be”, preserved in: «جئى به من حوث بوث» *ġi’ bihi min ḥauθa bauθa*, where *ḥauθa* (in the Koran and PIP is always *ḥaiθu*)<sup>252</sup> “where(ever) he (may)” and (and) *bauθa* “he (may) not be” (LA, r. *bwθ*). The word *ḥauθa* denotes, according to LA (see r. ‘*ys*), “be, exist”. The word is a compound of \**ḥa-* perh. “place” and \**uθa* “be, exist” = Ug. ‘*θ*, Aram. ‘*yt*, l-*yt*, etc. see [r. *lyš*] in §2.21.2.1 above. It becomes clear that Aram. [‘*yt*] “there is, exist” is from \*‘*Wθ*, and Aram. [l-*yt*] is from {‘*l* “not” + ‘*Wθ* “be, exist”}.

For what concerns *bauθa* “not be”, it is a compound consisting of two parts: \**ba-* “not” and \**uθa* “to be, exist”.

**2.21.5.3** The negative [*\*b-*] may be present in CA *ba’aṭa*, *ba’ṭa* “to be at ease free of anxiety”: ‘*aṭṭa* “to groan out of exhaustion and anxiety”.

**2.21.5.4** The neg. under study is certainly present in the following CA old saying: «*ġā’a bi ‘al ‘amri min ḥassi-hi wa bassi-hi*», lit. *he came with*, i.e. *ġā’a bi* (= he brought, lit. “came with”) ‘*al ‘amri* (= the matter) *min* (= from) *ḥass-hi* (where it was: *ḥa-* “where”, \**ss* < ‘*s* “be”, -*hi* = pronoun) *wa* (= and) *bassi-hi* (was not: *ba* “not”, \**ss* < ‘*s* “be”, and -*hi* “pronoun”): cf. LA, r. [bs].

**2.21.5.5** The neg. [*b-*] became an inseparable part of the root in some Egyp. words as in *b’l* “blind”, a compound of neg. [*b*] and [‘*l*] “eye”. For [‘*l*] “eye”, see §2.17.2 above.

**2.21.5.6** Soq. *biši* “nothing, not”, analyzed as consisting of *bi* “in” plus [‘*ši*] (= CA *šai’u* “thing”): cf. DRS I, 18. This analysis is wrong on the account that a combination of *bi* “in” and *ši* “thing” would yield a signification “in a thing or there is (a thing)”, as SL *fī šī*

<sup>252</sup> Farāhīdī (Al ‘Ayn III, 285) ascribes *ḥauθu* to Tamīm dialect.

id., or bi šī lit. "in a thing or with a thing" also "what is the matter with him", but never "nothing, not".

The Soq. word is most certainly a compound of \*bi "not" + šī "thing" = CA *lā šai* "nothing, not a thing" = SL *māšī* "nothing, not", from *mā* "not" and *šī* "thing", which is in turn = Soq. *bišī* "nothing, not" above. The difference here lies only in the choice of neg.

#### Comments

A marked linguistic feature characterizes the Lebanese dialect of Arabic in general, and SL in particular, is the use of prefixed b- with the imperfect as in *b-yiktib* "he writes" (CA *yaktubu*), *b-nisma'* "we hear" (CA *nasma'u*), *b-tēhuḍ* "you (masc.) take" (CA *ta'huḍu*). This feature is unfound in CA and it is foreign to all Semitic languages except ancient Qatabanian and Minaean. Beeston (1962:24-25) writes:

*«A special characteristic of Qat. is the use of imperfects with prefix b-, the normal rule seems to be that every Qat. imperfect has this prefix unless it is introduced by l- or a conditional particle... Such a formulation would bring the Qat. imperfect usage very close to Syro-Palastinian dialect of Arabic...Imperfects with prefix b- are also encountered in Min., though rarely».*

The prefix b- is not used in SL if the imperfect is preceded by /l-/ "for, to, in order to" (CA *li*) or its synonymous *ḥittā* (CA *ḥattā*)<sup>253</sup>

b-yis'al "he asks" (CA *yas'alu*) > la-yis'al ~ *ḥittā yis'al* (CA *li-yas'ala*, *ḥattā yas'ala*).

bi-kūn "he is" (CA *yakūnu*) > la-y(i)kūn, ans so forth.

What is the origin of the prefix b-? It is most likely an ancient form of a proot \*bā'a "to dwell, live", which was once used to express "to be".

Some reflexes of [bw'] are seen in nearly all HS languages, but the original signification has been partly preserved in CA: *bā'a* expresses "to dwell, live" as in the Koran: (نتبوا من الجنة حيث نشاء) *We may dwell in the gardens wherever we please* (39: 74); *bā'a* "to return to one's *mabā'a*-tu or *bā'a*-tu, i.e. home, to come back home, return (home)". For its HS cognates, see §2.9.27 above.

As a matter of fact, CA *bā'a* does not overtly express "to be", though it seems that its surviving imperative form *bu'* (followed by bi "with, by"), approaches this signification in some pre-Islamic idioms and proverbs, as in «*bu' bi šis'i na'lay Kulayb*». The signification attached to *bu'* is, generally speaking, "be equal or like, be equivalent to, be the same as", but not the mere 'be'.

#### 2.21.6 PHS NEGATIVE \*t-

Negative /t-/ is found in Semitic, notably in CA, as part of the root in a number of

<sup>253</sup> Also, the prefix is not usually used if the imperfect is preceded by 'am- (a model auxiliary forming the progressive and a reduced form of 'ammāl "doing": CA 'amila "do"), or another auxiliary.

unquestionable cases, and like, [d-] and [ṭ-], might have been developed from a proot signifying “earth, below, down”. Müller (1975: 71) compares Yeminite-Arabic *dow*, *dā*, *dawwa* Negationspartikel with Cush.: Had, Sid., Al., Mag, Gim., Kafa -*t* (-ti, -te), Chad.: Kot. *d’ô* id., etc. (also see DRS III, 201). SL (as well as in other Arabic dialects) the form *du*, in emphasis *duwwa*, is used in warning a baby of potential harm or danger, and may have a number of slightly differentiated meanings depending on the situation that calls for its use. However, the most common meaning is “do not”. This negative element is also seen in Sab. *d’* (Beeston, 1962: 66).

Since CA and other Semitic languages also have a negative element \**d*(’)- seen, like some other negatives, as part of the trilateral root, one has to be aware of the fact that ṭ-, which frequently exchanges positions with them, could also be negative in some trilaterals.

**2.21.6.1** CA *tunāsu* “lower classes of people, riff-raff, vulgar” is a compound of \**t*- perhaps “degradative(?)”, a variant of \**t*- “un-, the opposite of” and \**nāsu*- “people”. The second part is seen in CA *nāsu* “people”. A similar meaning can be expressed with the phrase *dūn n-nās*

**2.21.6.2** CA *tariḥa* “be grieved, afflicted” is a compound of \**t*- (above) and \**raḥ*- “to relieve, be at ease” as in CA *raḥraḥa*, with reduplication, “be at ease”; *raḥraḥa*-tu “enlargement”, Sab. *rwḥ*-t “enlargement” (SD, 119).

By the adoption of different Semitic prefixes, a number of trilaterals have been developed from \**raḥ*. Some of them are:

a) CA *fariḥa*, the antonym of *tariḥa* above, “be happy, glad”; *fariḥu* “happy, glad”, Mand. *prh* “to rejoice”, a compound of \**p*- and \**raḥ*-. Both *farḥatu* “joy, happiness” and its antonym *tarḥatu* occur in this verse of Poet.

«*wa mā farḥatun ’illā satu’ḳibu tarḥatan...*» (Al ‘ayn III, 190).

b) CA *mariḥu* “one who is merry, lively” > *mariḥa* “to rejoice, be jovial” < *mu-rīḥu* “comfortable, pleasant”, a compound of \**m*- and \**raḥ*-.

The above-mentioned trilaterals cannot be based on [\**raḥ*-], but rather on {*rau-ḥ*-.}. This compound is seen in CA CIV ‘*arāḥa* “make at ease, to relieve”; CVIII ‘*irtāḥa* “be pleased, be at ease”; rawḥu, rūḥu “happiness, joy”; OAram. *rwḥ* “relief”, BAram. *rwḥ* “to take delight”, OffAram., Palm. *rwḥ* “tranquility, respite”, as a verb, Palm “to set at large, relieve” (NWSI, II, 1062, 1065-1066), BHeb. *reyaḥ* “enlargement, relief”, esp. *from straits* (OT, 966), Tham. *rḥ* “joy”; *rḥ*-t “rest” (Branden, 1950: 518) = CA *rāḥa*-tu id.

**2.21.6.3** CA *tāsā*-hu [r. *tws*] “he hurts and ridicules him”: ‘*āsā*-hu (~ *wāsā*-hu) “he relieves, consoles, and comforts him”, Sab. *wsy* “to comfort” (SD, 164). If /-*sā*/ is from an earlier /-*ṯā*/, as my intuition strongly suggests, then /*ta*-/ will be the known HS prefix (see §2.7 above) and /’*a*- ~ *wa*-/ a neg. prefix.

**2.21.6.4** BHeb. *tāpar* “to sew together” (OT, 1114) < CA *farā*, *farra* “to cut, tear apart” also “to cut off the worn-out piece of a garment, etc. *in order to repair it or sew it back*

together”. LA [r. fry] states: «*scholars say that farā signifies “damage, destroy, vitiate” and ‘afrā (i.e. its false CIV) “mend, repair, correct”*». It seems that BHeb. t- = CA ’-. For the negative /’-/ , see §2.21.1 above. In SL the verb farr signifies precisely “to unsew (anything, esp. *clothes*), dismantle” also faraṭ id. (\*par- “to divide, cut” in §2.1.9.4 above).

Berb.: Kabyl əfru “to untie”, Chad.: Kwan apre “to untie”, Migama ’ipiro id., Mokilko ’eppire id., Sumray ’awəre, Lele poor id., Mwulyen upuran, Tera pərə “to untie”, Matakam pər id., Cush.: Som. furayya, Oromo fura “to untie” (HSED, n. 2013). It seems that initial /’-/ here is caus. = CA CIV ’afrā ~ ’afarra (see *false CIV* above).

1) It is interesting to note that if we reverse the order of \*par we get the idea “to sew together” as in CA rafau-tu “I sewed together”, rafa’-tu id., etc., BHeb. rp’ “to sew together” (see §2.15.17 above). But, SL raṯai-t “I patched or mended together, e.g. *old clothes*” (cf. CA raṯu, SL raṯṯ “worn out, of anything, esp. *clothes*), in most other dialects of Arabic ratā id. is used, from CA ratā “bring or draw together” (I use here raṯā id.; raṯṯa (and not ratta as in most other dialects of Arabic) “one who sews clothes”).

2) Phoen. rtm “to bind” (NWSI II, 1088), BHeb. rtm “to bind on, make fast”, CA CIV ’artama “to bind a thread upon the finger” (OT, 999) also “to bring together two branches of tree... etc.” (SHH V, 1926). All seem to be from the same word in CA ratā “to strengthen and make taut” also “to combine, bring together”; ratwa-tu “knot”.

**2.21.6.5** CA tbl expresses ideas like “enmity; perishability; illness; unfit, etc.” (ML I, 363): tbl = perish as in the PIP of A’sha:

«...raybu (’a)l manūni wa dahrūn hā’inun *tabilu*»

And tbl = “be ill, sick” as in the PIP of Zuhair Bin Abi Salma:

«bānat Su’ādu faḳalbi l-yauma *matbūlu*...»

The root [bl] expresses “fit” in a saying «’innahu *layaballu bihi* (’a)l *hairu*» (ML I, 189); billa-tu “growth, prosperity” also “health; regaining one’s health” as in *balla min marāḍihi*, i.e. *bari’a min marāḍihi* “regain one’s health” (LA, r. bll). For [br’], see §2.21.7.5 below; balla “to triumph” (see §2.21.7.4 below), etc.

A basic question rises, *is /t-/ of [tbl] a negative prefix?* In fact, the example above is misleading and, for this reason, has been carefully chosen to serve one purpose: *one should not fall into the pitfalls of surface dissimilarities between words or roots in dealing with this topic*. The prefix /t/, serving to form a noun from a verb, has been added to two traditional roots of different origins: [bly] “to perish, wear out, etc.” (see §2.3.22 above) and [bl] above.

### 2.21.7 PHS NEGATIVE d-

The following illustrative examples are all drawn from the trilateral [dbr] and its antonym [br]. It is most likely that both /d-/ and /t-/ are orig. variants of one form.

**2.21.7.1** OArām. dbrh “plague, demon” (NWSI I, 238, see under dbh), CA dabra-tu “evil” < CA bāru, birru “good, just, righteous; godliness”; barra “be just, true, good, benevolent”, Akk. barru “pure”, Ug. brr “be free, pure”, Min. šbrr “to purify” (DRS II,

87), Palm., Nab. brr “to purify” (NWSI I, 203), BHeb. brr id. (Ryder, 1974: 109), Tham. br “be just, charity” (Branden, 1950: 512).

**2.21.7.2** CA ’udābiru subst. = the antonym of bāru: CA bāru “one who is dutiful to one’s parents and family”, pl. ’abrāru (Koran 82:13); barra, CIV ’abarra “be dutiful to one’s parents and family”, Sab. brr “faithfully perform duty” (SD, 31).

**2.21.7.3** CA ta-dābara, said of members of a family, “be at enmity” < barra, used with members of a family, “be on good terms”.

**2.21.7.4** CA dabra-tu “defeat” < ’ibrāru “victory”; mubirru “victorious”, CIV ’abarra “to triumph, subdue an enemy, be a high-handed man”, Sab. caus. hbryw, brw “to destroy enemy” (SD, 32).

**2.21.7.5** CA dabira “be injured, wounded”; madbūru “wounded” < barī’u means, according to Ibin A’rābi (LA, r. br’), “sound and healthy”, bari’a “become healthy”, Talm. br’ “healthy, strong” (DRS II, 80), Sab. bry “health, soundness” also “become healthy” (SD, 32).

**2.21.7.6** CA dabara “to die”; dabru “destruction, death, calamity”, Akk. dibir-“calamity” (DRS III, 213), BHeb. deber “destruction, death” (OT, 213) < bara’a “to give birth to, bring forth, create”, BHeb. br’ “to create, bring forth”, Syr., BAram. br’ “to create” (OT, 155). The two opposing ideas here may be “to destroy” vs “construct, create”.

**2.21.7.7** CA dubra, said of the day of the month, “the last day”; dubru, duburu “the last (of anything)”; dabara “be behind, follow from behind”; it also occurs in this proverb «šarru ’ar-ra’yi ’ad-dabriyyu», *the worst or evil opinion is one that comes when it is too late* (Amali I, 277), BHeb. dbr “be behind, follow from behind” (OT, 210), Pun. dbr “situated in the rear” (NWSI I, 240) < CA barā’u, said of the day of the month, “the first day”; barīru “first-fruits”.



## 2.22 TENSES

It is hardly possible to talk about negatives without mentioning the verb, to which the negatives are usually added. It may, therefore, be well to give an account of the *tenses*, with some emphasis on CA. Gray (1971: §358) finds that:

«The ancient Semitic languages possessed at least two tenses, commonly called ‘perfect’ and ‘imperfect’... the former (denotes) an action or state completed, and hence perfect; the latter an action or state not completed, and hence imperfect».

For example, CA perf. *katab-nā* expresses “we wrote (wrote we)”, imperf. *na-ktubu* “we write”. The future is usually expressed with the imperfect often followed by an adverbial of time as in *naktubu yadan* “we (will) write tomorrow” or by placing the word *saufa* or its reduced form *sa* before the imperfect as in *saufa naktubu* ~ *sanaktubu* “we will write” (§2.20.5, n. 2 above).

The negation of the perfect and imperfect as well as the future is expressed by using the *imperfect form* and placing a different negative element for each tense, in other words, *it is the negative that indicate the tense of the verb*, as follows:

Perf.	<i>katabnā</i>	“we wrote”	> neg. <i>lam</i>	<i>naktub</i> - <sup>254</sup>
Imperf.	<i>naktubu</i>	“we write”	> neg. <i>lā</i>	<i>naktub</i> -
Fut.	<i>sanaktubu</i>	“we will write”	> neg. <i>lan</i>	<i>naktub</i> -

It should be noted that ‘future’ (*sanaktubu*) can only be negated, if *sa-* is dropped. A sentence like *\*lan sanaktub* is never permissible. *This fact is evidence that future is a later development.*

The negation of the perfect may also be expressed by placing *mā* before the perfect form as in

Perf. *mā katab-nā* “we did not write” (lit. not wrote we).

1) One basic difference between /*lam*/ and /*mā*/ is that the former is confined to the verb; it negates the imperfect and shifts its signification from present to past (Ṣahibi, 168), while the latter is also used with some other parts of speech as in *mā zaidun ḡālisan* “Zaid (is) not sitting” (= not Zaid sitting), and in the Koran: (ما هن أمهاتهم), *they (are) not their mothers* (58:2). Another difference is that they are never used interchangeably. One can say *mā katabnā*, *We didn’t write*, but never *\*lam katabna*; and conversely, one can say *lam naktub*, *We didn’t write*, but not *\*mā naktub*.

A further comparison between /*lam*/ and /*mā*/ in respect to usage and structure compels us to raise the doubt concerning the morphological structure of /*lam*/ and not of /*mā*/. ‘*Lam*’ is a word expressing simultaneously {not + past tense}, whereas /*mā*/ is a word expressing the mere idea “not” and has nothing to do with the notion ‘past tense’.

<sup>254</sup> Negative /*lm*/ occurs in ESA, namely *Harami*, with imperfect verb as in *lm yysʿl* (Beeston, 1962: 66) = CA *lam yayasil* “he didn’t wash”.

A different /*lm*/ expressing an opposite meaning, i.e. *an affirmative meaning*, is seen in OffAram., DAram. *lm*.

2) As for /lan/, it is confined to verbs, exactly like /lam/. But, unlike /lam/, it expresses "strong negation + action/state/process in existence at the moment of speaking and will continue forever". Both negatives /lam/ and /lan/ occurs in this Koranic verse: (فإن لم تفعلوا ولن فاتقوا النار) *And if you do not and never shall you do then guard yourselves against the (Hell) fire* (2:24): see n. 3 below.

2a) It should be stressed that the use of the *past tense* to indicate the *present* or even the *future* is not uncommon in CA. Nor is it uncommon to express the past tense with the *present + adverb of time*. This feature could be evidence of the former absence of tenses in Hamito-Semitic. For the following examples and for additional examples, see Bin Faris (Ṣahibi, 223) and Tha'ālibi (FL, §19, p. 301).

Koranic (أتى أمر الله), *The decree of God (has) come(s)* (16:1): أتى /'atā/ = "it came", but its meaning here is "it comes" or "has come". Other examples from the Koran include: (إن الله كان غفورا رحيمًا) *Verily, God is Forgiving, Merciful* (4:23), where كان /kāna/ regularly signifies "was", but its semantic scope includes in this verse "past + present + future", (فلا صدق ولا صلى), *for He does not believe in the truth nor does he offer the regular prayers* (75:31). In this Koranic verse we find that فلا...لا "neither...nor" is placed before the preterits ṣaddaḡa "he believed" and ṣallā "he prayed", but the combination has a present meaning. Farāhīdi (Al 'ayn VIII, 321) tends to accept /lā/ when it is repeated twice as in the foregoing Koranic verse, but he rejects it when unrepeated as in the following verse of Poet.:

«'in tayfiri ('a)l lāhumma tayfir ḡammā  
wa 'ayyu 'abdin laka lā 'alammā»

The negative particle can occur before the perfect only when there is a sequence of two or more verbs, and with the signification 'neither... nor', exactly as Farāhīdi had stated. It is neither acceptable in CA nor in all its modern forms to use /lā/ before a single perfect verb, hence utterances like \*lā ṣaddaḡa, \*lā ṣallā, \*lā kataba (wrote), \*lā ḡara'a (read), and so on do not sound Arabic. Accordingly, the use of lā before the perfect, as in the verse of poetry above, is definitely wrong.

On the other hand, we also find instances in which the *present tense + adverb of time* is used to express the past tense as in the Koran: (فلم تقتلون أنبياء الله من قبل) *Why then you kill the apostles of God aforeside* (2: 91), where تقتلون /taḡtulūna/ = "you (pl.) kill" is used instead of /ḡatalum/ "you (pl.) killed". An interesting example is (Poet.)

«...wa lam 'ada' liman kāna ba'd-ī...»,

where the utterance /kāna ba'd-ī/ regularly signifies "was after me", but in this context it means lit. "will be after me", and the meaning of the cited part of the verse thus becomes "...and I did not leave for those who will come after me...". Such examples in which the time difference is not clear may stress the aspectual nature of the two tenses.

3) CA negatives /lan/ and /lam/ are two compound words sharing in common the initial neg. [-l-]: \*-n "present/future negative" and \*-m "past negative".

CA furnishes concrete evidence supporting our logical inferences: CA [r. 'ny, 'nn] as in the Koran: (ألم يأن للذين آمنوا أن تخشع قلوبهم لذكر الله) *Has not the time yet (come), for those who believe that their hearts become humble for the remembrance of God* (57:16). In this verse of the holy Koran, /'a/ "interrogative", /lam/ "not", /ya-'in/ = /ya-/ "they",

/ʾin/ “time yet”. The word ‘come’ has been inserted to help understand the meaning. Another example, *ʾāna lahu ʾan yaʾtī* = lit. “at this time for him that he comes = *it is now ~ right now ~ at the present time for him to come*. We can firmly conclude that CA \*ʾn- means “now”, and that /lan/ is a blend of l(ā) + (ʾ)an > lan.

All old Arab scholars *agree* that {lan} is a compound of two elements, but disagree on what the elements are. Some say: it consists of {lā + ʾan}, some others of {law + lam}, others of {lam + lā}, and still others of {la + lā}. Their failure to pinpoint the origin of the word was largely due to their emphasis on its syntactic function, rather than on its morphology and semantics. Even their division of the word into two parts was only an attempt to explain (the obvious) *why the following verb ends in -a* (i.e. *manṣūb*): cf. LA, r. [ln]. However, I have recently found that Farāhīdī divided the word, more than 13 centuries ago, into lā “not” and ʾan “this time” (Ṣāhibī, p. 169).

4) The morpheme /ʾāna/ “now” is seen in CA with prefixed /ʾal/ “this, the” as in {ʾal ʾāna} “now”, lit. “the present, this time, (right) now”. The form is also seen in other Semitic languages as in Akk. *inanna* (i-na-an-na) “now” (AG, 57, 79), Assy. *eninna*, *inanna id.* (King, 1898: 330, 334). The Akk. word is a compound of \*el-/\*il- (= CA ʾal) and \*-an(n) “now, present” (= CA ʾnn above): for the definite article /ʾal/, see below. The change of \*-el- to \*en-/in- in Akk. is certainly due to assimilation.

What would CA /ʾalʾāna/ have been like if it had similarly lost \*ʾa-? It would definitely have been ʾannāna, according to the rule of complete assimilation of /ʾal/ (comp. \*ʾal nāru “the fire” > ʾannāru) as will be outlined below.

5) As a rule in CA, if the definite article /ʾal/ is followed by a word beginning with an interdental, dental, or palatal /š/, then /l/ assimilates completely to the initial sound of the word, i.e. ʾaθ-θauru “the bull”, ʾaδ-δā-tu “the self, soul”, ʾat-tamru “the dates”, ʾad-dāru “the house”, ʾaṭ-ṭāʾiru “the bird”, ʾan-nāsu “the people”, ʾaḏ-ḏabābu “the fog”, ʾaḏ-ḏufu “the finger-nail”, ʾas-samāʾu “the sky”, ʾaṣ-ṣautu “the sound”, ʾar-raʾsu “the head”, ʾaš-šamsu “the sun”. But the rule does not seem to apply to /ġ/, a palatal stop corresponding to Akk.-Ug.-BHeb.-Phoen.-Aram. velar stop /g/, as in ʾal-ġabalu “the mountain”, ʾal-ġawābu “the answer”. This phenomenon enables us to establish two facts:

5a) CA /ġ/ is not originally palatal. The reason is obvious; if it was palatal we would say \*ʾaġ-ġabalu instead of ʾal-ġabalu. In some modern dialects, including mine, /ʾal-/ is often /ʾaġ-/ before a word beginning with /ġ-/: Leb. ʾaž žabal or ʾal-žabal “the mountain”. It is interesting to note that CA /ġ/ has undergone various changes in its modern dialects. It is /g/ in Egyptian, /ž/ in Lebanese, /y/ in some Gulf dialects (Kuwait), /dž/ in Iraq.

5b) *Assimilation* took place in CA long before the change of Semitic \*g to /ġ/. In fact, when the change took place in CA, assimilation had long been completed. Otherwise, if assimilation was still in process when the change occurred, then ʾal- would be pronounced \*ʾaġ- before ġabalu and ġawābu.

The discovery of [-n] as *present tense marker* in a language like CA allows us to make a factual statement that [-m] *must be a past tense marker*. This is the same -m “afore, past” seen in BHeb. šilšōm “the day before yesterday”: šš = CA ʾlθ = three (see §2.12.5, ft <sup>1</sup> above).

### 2.22.1 Additional Remarks On Semitic Tenses

Before closing this section, I still have a few words to say about the verb. As pointed out above, there is some evidence, though not so strong, for supposing that Hamito-Semitic had at one time only a present tense. A number of questions may be rightly raised in this respect: *was the imperfect in HS truly verbal?* Another, *how was the perfect developed?* In what follows, we will examine closely how the *perfect* and *imperfect* are expressed in Semitic in *an attempt to uncover the deep reality that underlies their deceptive surface differences*. As one should expect, *our task here will never be a paraphrase or restatement of surface facts already established by old Arab scholars and Semitists, but rather the breaking of new ground and the discovery of new facts that has nothing to do with such scholars' wrong and misleading views*.

*Imperfect*: CA *yaktubu*, BHeb. *yiktōb* “he writes”, consisting of the personal prefix \*ya- “he” and stem \*ktub-.

*Perfect*: CA *kataba*, BHeb. *kātab* “he wrote”, consisting of a stem *katab-* and ‘a zero’ personal ending. The ‘zero’ here is a personal pronoun as meaningful as -t of *kataba-t* “she wrote” or any other personal ending. For all other persons, there are personal endings as in CA *katab-tu* “I wrote”, *katab-nā* “we wrote”, *katabā* 3<sup>rd</sup> dual masc., *katabtumā* 2<sup>nd</sup> dual masc., etc. In addition, for all persons, except the 1<sup>st</sup> plural and 3<sup>rd</sup> (masc. sg., and masc. dual) perfect, the /-t-/ ending is maintained.

Comparison of the *perfect* and *imperfect* shows three conspicuous facts.

1) First, the difference between perfect *katab-* and imperfect \*-ktub- lies in the vowel sounds as follows: the vowel of the first syllable (in the perfect stem) -a- > Ø in the imperfect, thus giving rise to the cluster /-kt-/ , while the vowel of the second syllable -a- > -u-. This latter change is not as important as the former change, since there are imperfect stems formed without such change, e.g. CA *Perf. sa'al* “ask” > *Imperf. yas'al*.

There is, of course, another difference. The imperfect has prefixed personal elements (e.g. CA *na-ktubu*, BHeb. *ni-ktōb* “we write”), hence, we may call it *a prefix-conjugation*, while the perfect has suffixes (e.g. CA *katab-nā*, BHeb. *kātab-nū* “we wrote”), hence *a suffix-conjugation*. The *prefix-suffix-conjugations* are important in Canaanite, Aramaic, and Arabic only. However, Akkadian has two prefix-conjugations:

(a) *preterit* {stem iFḡuL}, denoting completed action (= CA, BHeb., Aram. *perfect*), as in *iškun* “set, establish” (CA *sakana*), *iṭtur* “tear away” (CA *faṭara*)

(b) *present* {stem iFaḡḡaL} as in *išakkan*, *ipaṭṭar*.

2) Second, the *perfect stem* is much closer to a masc. noun stem than the *imperfect* in that the *perfect* has, like many nouns, two vowels in the stem. Even when a noun has only one stem vowel as in *ra's-u* “head”, the vowel always appears after the first radical, but never after the second radical as in the *imperfect* for phonotactic considerations.

3) Gray (1971:§362), among others, believes that the *perfect* developed from the noun stem, and that Semitic originally had one tense, the *imperfect*. He writes:

«Apparently Semitic had at one time only a single ‘tense’, the *atelic*, which expressed action or state for past, present, and future alike. This seems to have been truly verbal. The ‘*telic*’ (*perfect*), on

*the other hand, would appear to have developed later, and to have been formed by a noun of action (\*katab-, \*katib-, \*katub-) which in the third singular masculine sufficed in itself to serve as a verb, while the other persons received the appropriate personal pronouns either prefixed (in Akk., as taktub) or affixed (in the other languages, as Arabic katabta), so \*katab- meant something like “he (is) a writer”...».*

Moscatti (1969: §16.29) finds that the conjugation of Akk. verb having the pattern FaḡiL «represents in essence the conjugation of a noun and may constitute a verbal adjective (e.g. *damiḡ* “he is good”, *baḡāku* “I am alive”) as well as a substantive (e.g. *zikaṛāku* “I am a man”, from *zikaṛu* “man”)».

4) The similarity between the *perfect* and the *noun* with regard to the stem, as shown above, seems to lie beneath the assumption that the *perfect* has developed from a noun stem. As a matter of fact, the *imperfect stem* is ‘in depth’ as similar to the noun stem as the *perfect*. This stem has a surface form \*-FḡvL- (v = a, i, or u) as in CA *ya-s’alu* “he asks”, *ya-ḏribu* “he strikes”, *ya-ktubu* “he writes”, but the underlying form is definitely \**ya-FaḡvL-*. The stem vowel \*/-a-/ is kept under the following conditions:

4a) When lengthened as in CA CIII *yukātibu* “he corresponds with”.

4b) Before a doubled second radical as in CA CV *yukattibu* “he makes someone write”.

4c) In reduplicated stems as in CA *yulamlimu* “he collects”. Examples from all other Semitic languages will be given in 4d below.

The loss of /-a-/, however, is quite predictable, and can thus be accounted for in terms of the following phonological rule:

Rule I: FaḡvL → -FḡvL / Cv — #

To be read as FaḡvL (e.g. *sa’al*) > -FḡvL (-s’al) when it appears (= /) in the environment (= —) after Cv, a consonant followed by a vowel.

Compare CA *’in-satara* “be concealed” with BHeb. *ni-star id.* and CA *’in-sa’ala* “be asked” with BHeb. *ni-š’al* “ask for oneself”. We may note that the rule applies to BHeb. forms because its prefix ends in a vowel, but it does apply to those of CA because their prefix ends in a consonant. Notice that if you substitute CA *na-* “we” for /’in-/, *rule I* will apply: *na-sturu* “we conceal”.

The rule may also explain the loss of this same /-a-/ in the perfect stem as prefixes added to it to form derivatives. e.g.

i) Akk. *maškanu*, CA *maskanu*, BHeb. *miškān* “dwelling-place”: cf. CA *sakana* “to dwell”, Akk. *šakānu*,

ii) BHeb. *hi-ḡdīš* “to consecrate”, Akk. *uša-lbiš* “to clothe”, BAram. *ha-lbēš id.*, CA *’a-lbasa id.*

4d) It may be interesting to note that the vowel /a/ does not drop in the perfect stem in the same environments specified above for that of the imperfect, e.g.

i) ḡama’a “to gather”; CV taḡamma’a “be gathered”, CVI taḡāma’a; CVII ’inḡama’a (but not in CIV ’aḡma’a “unanimously agree” or maḡma’u “assembly”, etc. *Rule I*),

ii) BAram. *hiṡabbal* “be destroyed”, Syr. *’etbarrak* “be blessed”, Eth. *taḡaddasa* “be declared holy”, *tasākala* “be propitious”, Syr. *’etbalbal* “be confused”, CA *takabkaba*

“be overthrown”, BHeb. *hiṭḥalḥēl* “to writhe with anxiety”.

In accordance with the new fact just shown above, we may state that *one single phonological rule is capable of specifying the environments in which the stem vowel /a/ is kept or dropped in all Semitic derivatives*, including the perfect and imperfect.

5) The foregoing discussion shows clearly that both *the perfect* and *imperfect* originally had a stem containing two vowels {FaɣvL}. Of these vowels, the first is /-a-/ and the second could be any of the three vowels /a, u, i/.

5a) In my outline of derived stems in §2.1.7.3 above, I followed old Arab grammarians and Semitists and treated CX {’istaFɣaLa} as being derived from CI {FaɣaLa}. I have found that CX (§2.1.7.3, n. 10) is morphologically and semantically related to CIV (§2.1.7.3, n. 4). The correct derivation is therefore:

CIV ’a-FɣaLa > CX \*’ista-’a-FɣaLa > ’ista-FɣaLa

One can easily see how syllables are dropped in the process of derivation: CX lost caus. -’a- (of CIV). On the other hand, it should be stressed that *Rule I* above applies perfectly to both the perfect and imperfect of these two classes.

5b) The basic meaning of CIV is ‘MAKE another (others/something) DO’ and that of CX ‘MAKE oneself DO’ as in ’asma’a “make someone hear” > ’istama’a “make oneself hear” = ‘listen’ (comp. CI sami’a “to hear”), ’akfā lit. “he caused someone/something to have enough” > ’istakfā “he caused himself to have enough” (comp. CI kafā “be enough”), ’a’adda “make something or someone ready” > ’ista’adda “make oneself ready” (comp. ’adda “be ready”). Regardless of the origin of initial \*’i- (e.g. CVII, CX, etc.), it disappears in the imperfect, hence *yastami’u* “he listens”, *yasta’iddu* “he makes himself ready”, etc Rules I).

Some additional examples are: CIV ’ahfā “to hide (something or somebody)” > CX ’istahfā “to hide oneself”; ’arāḥja “give rest to someone” > ’istarāḥja “give oneself rest”, CIV ’asḫā “cause someone to drink, give someone something to drink” > CX ’istasḫā “ask for (oneself) something to drink”; CIV ’aḥalla “make something lawful for others, place someone in a place” > CX ’istaḥalla “to think that it is lawful (for oneself to do), place oneself in a place”, CIV ’aš’ara “make one feel”; CX ’istaš’ara “make oneself feel” (ša’ara “to feel”), CIV ’aḫra’a “make someone read” > CX ’istaḫra’a “make one self read”, CIV ’aḫāla “make someone resign” > CX ’istaḫāla “make oneself resign”, CIV ’ayḫḏa “to wake up someone” > CX ’istayḫaḏa lit. “wake oneself up”, CIV ’a’lama “make someone know” > CX ’ista’lama “make oneself know”, CIV ’abāḥja “to allow someone to do (usu. a bad action)” > CX ’istabāḥja “to allow oneself do (a bad action)”, and so forth.

6) To return to Akk. two prefix-conjugations, the preterit *iptur* is markedly different from *ipaṭṭar*, according to Moscati (1969:§16.29), in that it «has a different vowel and syllable distribution (inner morphemes)». In accordance with *rule I* above, Akk. \*paṭur > -pṭur when preceded by a vowel. Thus Akk. *iptur* is from \*ipaṭur, and the difference in the number of syllables between the two conjugation is a surface one, exactly like that between CA-BHeb.-Aram. *katab*- “he wrote” > *ya-ktub* “he writes” above.

As for the difference in the vowels of the second syllable between \*paṭur and \*paṭṭar, this difference has also been noted in other Semitic languages as in CA *’ahaḏa* “he took” > *ya’huḏu* “he takes”, *sami’a* “he heard” > *yasma’u* “he hears”, etc. A similar

kind of vowel variations in the second syllables of the perfect and imperfect stems {-paṭur & -paṭṭar} is also noted in Akk., as the following examples may show: *irmuk* “to pour out” > *irammuk*, *iḥhis* (*inḥis*) “to subside, go” > *inaḥḥis*, *ītiḫ* “to go, march; remove from” (CA ‘ataḫa) > *ittiḫ*, *imḥaṣ* “to smite” (CA maḥaḏa) > *imaḥḥaṣ*, *izīr* “to hate” (CA zariya) > *izirri*, etc. It seems that the difference between Akk. preterit and present lies only in the doubling of the second radical in the present stem.

7) To sum up, the foregoing discussion attempts to point out one simple fact that, disregarding personal affixes, the Semitic deep perfect and imperfect forms of a trilateral verb are composed of two syllables {FaɣvL-}. The vowel of the first syllable is always /-a-/, whereas the vowel of the second may be /a, i, or u/. One possible explanation of this fact is that the original proot had a root vowel /-a-/. The choice between /a, i, or u/ depends on the part of speech from which the verb is derived. For example, verbs whose 2<sup>nd</sup> stem vowel is /-u-/ are formed from adjectives as in CA *kabura* “become big, grow” < adj. *kabīru*, *ṣayura* “become small” < adj. *ṣayīru*, *ḥasuna* “become fair, good” < adj. *ḥasanu*, and so forth. My final word on the origin verbs will be stated in §2.25 below.

### 2.22.2 PERSONAL PRONOUNS

Several years ago I dealt at considerable length with the paradigm of the verb and, of course, with all *dependent* (prefixed & suffixed) and *independent personal pronouns*. But, when I found myself unable to account for the presence of suffixed /-t-/ in *katab-tu* “I wrote”, etc. and its disappearance in some forms, namely, the 1<sup>st</sup> plural (*katab-nā* “we wrote”) and 3<sup>rd</sup> masc. sg. (*kataba* “he wrote”) and masc. dual (*katabā* “they both wrote”), I decided to eliminate the section. Now, after having regretted this decision, I return to give a very brief outline of my view on the origin of /-t-/ in Semitic perfect.

1) The suffix /-t-/ is seen in the Semitic perfect tense, but having been wrongly recognized as personal ending (or suffixed personal pronoun) by all Semitists and old Arab scholars. Thus CA *katab-tu* “I wrote” (i.e. *wrote I*), BHeb. *katab-tī*, Aram. *ketb-et* id. have all been analyzed throughout the history as consisting of a stem *katab-* “write” plus a suffixed personal pronoun *-tu* “I”, functioning as the subject of the verb.

1a) I strongly believe that Semitic *katabtu*, as an illustration, is from \**katab-* + *-t-* + *-’u*, where \**katab-* “writing”, \**-t-* “past tense marker”, and \**-’u* > *-u-* “I”, for ease of pronunciation. The glottal /-’-/ is seen as final in the 1<sup>st</sup> pers. pronoun \*[’n’] as in CA [’n’], BAram. ’n’, BHeb. ’ny (OT, 70-71), etc., being pronounced /ā/ in CA (’anā) and Aram. (cf. Syr. ’enā) or /ī/ in Heb. (’ānī). This is the same personal prefix that appears in the imperfect: cf. CA ’a-*ktubu* “I write”, Heb. ’a-*ktub*, Aram. (Syr.) ’e-*ktōb*, Eth. ’e-*kateb* id.

1b) O’Leary (1969: 139) considers the 1<sup>st</sup> pers. sg. [’n’] as a compound of «*demonstrative* /’an-/ with *pronominal* /’a/». Wright (1966: Chap. VI, first published in 1890) also considers \*’an- as demonstrative and offers an excellent surface description of Semitic pronouns. In fact, the demonstrative \*’an- is seen, as we should expect, in all personal pronouns except 3<sup>rd</sup> pers.

1c) Bearing in mind the exceptions cited above, for all other persons, the past tense marker \*-t and personal ending \*-t- = "you" have merged together into one single \*-t-, thus CA *katab-ta*, Heb. *kātab-tā*, Aram. *kātab-t* "you (masc. sg.) wrote (i.e. wrote you)", Akk. (permansive) *katba-t(ā)*, for instance, are all from *\*katab-t-ta*, i.e. from *katab* + \*-t- (past tense marker)<sup>255</sup> + *-ta* (you masc. sg.): comp. imperf. *ta-ktubu* "you (masc. sg.) write", Heb. *ti-ktōb* id., Akk. *ta-ktab*, Eth. *te-kateb*, Aram. *te-ktōb* id.

1d) To express "you pl. wrote", add to stem *katab-* above the past tense marker \*-t- followed by either the *masc. pl.* ending */-m/* (i.e. *-tu-* + *-m*) as in *katabtum* "you masc. pl. wrote" or the *fem pl.* ending */-n/* (i.e. *-tu-* + *-n*) as in *katabtunna* "you fem. pl. wrote" = Heb. masc. *kātabtem*; fem. *kātabten*, Akk. (permansive) masc. *katbātunū*; fem. *katbātinā*.

1e) As for the 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. dual *katabtum-ā* "you both wrote", it is based on the 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. pl. form *katabtum*, i.e. *it is formed from the 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. pl. form by suffixing the dual marker /-ā/*.

1f) The dual forms of the 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. masc. *katabā* and fem. *katabatā* are based on *kataba* "he wrote" and *katabti* "she wrote" respectively.

1g) The 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. masc. pl. *katabū* is based on the masc. sg. stem *katab(a)* "he wrote" plus a pl. */-ū/*, i.e. */w/*. In Egyp., too, *-w* is the ending of 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. masc. of old perf. (Gardiner, EG, §309)<sup>256</sup>.

1h) The 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. fem. pl. *katabna* is based on the 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. fem. sg. *katab(t)*, Akk. (permansive) masc. *katbū*; fem. *katbā*, Heb. masc./fem. *kāṭəbū*.

## 2) Independent Personal Pronouns

I have a few words to say about the ultimate origins of some independent personal pronouns, namely, the 3<sup>rd</sup> persons (sg. and plur), and the 2<sup>nd</sup> persons (sg. and pl.), together with their respective dual forms.

<sup>255</sup> It is possible that this */-t/* developed from either HS [d-] "already" (see §3.9.21 above) or [-ð] "afore, ago" (see §2.21.1, n. 2d above).

<sup>256</sup> Vycichl (1975: 205) argues that Egyp. pl. ending was */-ū/*, and not */-w/*, and that Hamito-Semitic had no pl. ending */-w/*, but only */-ū/*, e.g. in CA *-ū* as verbal ending and as nominal ending, in Housa *bindiga* "rifle", pl. *bindig-ū*, Som. kan masc. "this", pl. *k-u-an*.

The vowel in question, represented in the alphabet with */w/* and pronounced */ū/* as in *ktb-w* (*katab-ū*), i.e. *wrote-they*, is orig. a masc. pl. ending, and that it is prob. seen in at least one of CA broken pl. stems as in *raffu* masc. "shelf", pl. *rufūfu*, *rattu* masc. "master", pl. *rutūtu*, 'ahdu "covenant, pledge", pl. 'uhūdu, ḡaḏru "root", pl. ḡuḏūru, *namiru* "tiger", pl. *numūru*, and so forth. The change of sg. stem vowel */-a-/* of 1<sup>st</sup> syllable into */-u-/* is apparently due to vowel harmony, a phonological change common in both CA proper and some of its old dialects (see §2.7 above). The same type of change takes place when the vowel of the singular stem is */-i-/* as in 'ilmu "knowledge" > pl. 'ulūmu, ḡisru "bridge" > pl. ḡusūru: for more information on */w/* as a pl. marker, see §2.9, under *Comments* above.



2a) 3<sup>rd</sup> masc.: CA *huwa*, Ug. *hw*, Phoen., OAram., Moab. *h'*, BHeb. *hū'*, i.e. *hw'*), Sab. *h(w)'*, *hwt*, consisting of [hu] “he” and *-wa* perh. *a masc. case ending*. The proot [hu] also functions as a suffix-pronoun (object of the vb or prep. and possessive) as in CA *sa'ala-hu* “he asked him”, *baitu-hu* “his house”: Ug. *-h*, Heb., Eth. *-hū*, *-o*, Sab. *h(w)*.

In Akk. the pronoun is *šū* (i.e. *šw*), Qat. *s'w(t)* = Egyp. suffix-pronoun *sw* = ESA (except Sab.) suffix-pronoun *-s'(w)*.

3<sup>rd</sup> fem.: CA *hiya*, Ug. *hy*, Phoen., OAram., Moab. *h'*, BHeb. *hī'*, i.e. *hy'*, Sab. *h(y)'*, *hyt*, consisting of [hi] “she” and *-ya* perh. *a fem. case ending*. The proot [hi] becomes [hā] when it occurs as a suffix-pronoun as in CA *sa'ala-hā* “he asked her”, *baitu-hā* “her house”: Ug. *-h*, Heb., Eth. *-(h)ā*, Sab. *-h*.

In Akk. the pronoun is *šī* (i.e. *šy*), Qat. *s'y(t)* = Egyp. suffix-pronoun *sy* = ESA (except Sab.) *-s', -s'yw*.

2b) The 3<sup>rd</sup> masc. and fem. plurals are formed from the corresponding 3<sup>rd</sup> masc. and fem. singulars by suffixing the plural markers: masc. */-m/* and fem. */-n/* respectively.

3<sup>rd</sup> masc. pl.: CA *hum(u)*, Ug. *hm*, OAram. *hm*, *hmw*, Phoen. *hmt*, BHeb. *hēm(mā)*, BAram. *himmō*, Sab. *hmw*, *hmt*.

In Akk. and Egyp. both plural endings */-m/* and */-n/* fell together as */-n/*<sup>257</sup>, hence Akk. masc. *šunu*, fem. *šina*, Egyp. masc./fem. *sn*, ESA masc. *s'm*.

3<sup>rd</sup> fem. pl.: CA *hunna*, BHeb. *hēn(nā)*, BAram. *'innīn*, Sab. *hn*.

3<sup>rd</sup> dual pl.: CA *humā*, Ug. *hm*. It is based on the masc. pl. *hum* “they” plus *ā*. It is the same */ā/* in *sa'alā* “they both asked”; *sa'alā-hu* “they both asked him”, *ḡalamā...* “two pencils”, nom. *ḡalamāni*, acc., gen. (object of prep.) *ḡalamayni* id. The same dual form is used in CA and Ug. as a suffix-pronoun: CA *ra'ā-humā* “he saw both of them”, *la-humā* “for both of them”. ESA: Qat. *s'myt*.

2d) 2<sup>nd</sup> masc. sg.: CA, Eth. *'anta*, Ug. *at*, Akk., Heb. *attā*, Sab. *'nt*, consisting of [*'n*], perh. *a demonstrative*, plus pers. pron. *tu* or *tū* “thou” = Egyp. dependent pronoun *θw*, later *tw* “thou”. The same pronoun occurs as a suffix (perf.) and prefix (imperf.): CA perf. *sa'al-ta* “you asked”, imperf. *ta-s'alu* “you ask”. The same holds true for the corresponding fem. pron.

2<sup>nd</sup> fem. sg.: CA *'anti*, Akk. *attī*, Ug. *at*, Heb. *'att*, Eth. *'ntī*, a compound of [*'an*] plus */-ti/*.

2<sup>nd</sup> masc. pl. is formed from the masc. *ant-* by suffixing the plur. marker *-m*, CA *'antum(ū)*, Heb. *'attem*, Eth. *'antammu*. In Akk. masc. pl. */-m/* and fem. pl. */-n/*, as has already been mentioned fell together as */-n/*, hence masc. *attunu*, fem. *attina*.

2<sup>nd</sup> fem. pl.: CA *'antunna*, Heb. *'atten(ā)*, Eth. *'antən*.

<sup>257</sup> The same change is also found in SL and Leb. and other dialects, where the fem. pl. ending replaces the masc. */-m/* in independent and suffixed pronouns, and as a result *the difference in gender* has been lost: *hinni* “they” (replaces CA *hum* masc. “they”; *hunna* fem. “they”), *k(ə)tēb-kun* “your (pl.) book”, etc. Moreover, both CA *'anta* masc. sg. “you”, fem. *'anti* > masc./fem. *'inti*.

2<sup>nd</sup> dual: CA *'antumā*, from *'antum* “you plur” plus the dual marker /-ā/.

#### Comments

i) 3<sup>rd</sup> fem sg. *hiya* “she” is most likely from a compound \**hiy* and 2<sup>nd</sup> fem (*'an*)*ti* from \*(*'an*)*tiy* (see n. iii below). This alone can explain both Akk. long vowels in these two forms upon the loss of this /-y/ (n. 2a above) and CA /-nn/ in their respective plurals (n. 2b above); the 1<sup>st</sup> /-n-/ could be due to regressive assim. of /-y-/.

ii) It is possible that Sem. *'anḥnu* “we” (CA *naḥnu*, Akk. (*'a*)*nīnu* Phoen. *'nḥn*, OffAram., BAram. *'nḥnh* = *Egyp. inn*) is from an earlier \**'an-nu*, with /-ḥ-/ from a proot signifying = *all* (i.e. *all* + *us*) or *selves*. What may strengthen this view is that /-n/ alone and never /-ḥn/ is used as ‘object’ (CA -*nā*, *Egyp. -n*, etc.) and ‘genitive’ (Akk. -*ni*, CA -*nā*, *Egyp. -n*, etc.).

iii) The possibility that HS 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. *hw* “he”; *hy* “she” and *šw* “he”; *šy* “she” and their corresponding plural and dual forms could have been developed from two forms one of them was orig. used to refer to ‘things’ should not be dismissed.

Apart from this possibility, the 3<sup>rd</sup> sing is a compound of masc. *hu*, *šu* and fem. *hi*, *ši* plus masc. -w- and fem. -y- respectively.

iv) Our study of HS personal pronouns (independent and suffix-pronouns) shows that HS possesses three pl. endings /-m/, /-n/, and /-w/, pronounced /-ū/). In some cases, as in Sab. *hmw* above “they masc.” (to be pronounced *humū*), we have two plural markers *hu-m-w*. I have already drawn attention to /-w/ as a pl. marker of other parts of speech (see §2.9, under *Comments* above).

v) Dual forms found in CA are all PHS. Another PHS dual form expressing “we two” was preserved in Ug. *ny id.* and in *Egyp. -ny*. It consists of n- “we” plus dual -ā.

vi) *Egyp.-CA m'* “in the hand” has been analyzed in §2.17.30 above as a compound of [m] “in/with” and ['] “hand”, *m'k* as a compound of [m], ['], and [-k] “your masc. sing”, i.e. “with thee, you (masc. sg.) has, in your hand”; it is the very same /-k/ in CA *baytu-ka* “your house”, etc. *Egyp. m'í* “in my hand” = CA *m'y* (pronounced *ma'ī*) “with me”, i.e. *I have*”.

An important fact revealed from the analysis set forth above should be taken into consideration:

a) CA /-ī/ of *ma'ī* is from PHS suffix-pronoun /-’i/, i.e. ‘*me, my*’, which can also signify “me” after a verb as in *sa’ala-n-ī* “he asked (= *sa’ala*) me”; /-n-/ has been inserted to avoid a cluster of two vowels, i.e. /-a-ī-/<sup>258</sup>, which is a good possibility. *Egyp. -í* “I, me, my”.

If you take any suffix-pronoun (like *-hā* “her”, *-hu* “his”, *-hum* “their”, etc. and suffix it to *ma'-*, as in *ma'ahā*, *ma'ahu*, *ma'ahum*, you will find that the meaning of the

<sup>258</sup> The suffix /-nī/ is in Akk. -*ni*, Eth., Heb. *nī*, Ug., Aram. -*n*.

combination is the sum of the meanings of its three elements. This implies that /-ī/ is a suffix-pronoun and a variant of /'/ “I” in final position”. Also compare Egyp. n + -í “to me” and CA l + y (pronounced *lī*) id., bearing in mind that Egyp. -í is a suffix-pronoun expressing “I, my, me” above. The compound *in* + *hand* + *my* does not show any departure from HS word order.

In conclusion, a clear-cut distinction should be made between the above mentioned /-y/ and HS /-y/ = *belonging to, coming from*, etc. see §2.6 above.

## 2.23 NAMES OF ANIMALS IN HAMITO-SEMITIC

Triconsonantal words denoting animals in HS languages show a striking phenomenon. Nearly all basic words end in either -r, -l, or -b. Similarly, all their indispensable words for birds, reptiles, and insects often terminate in one of such radicals.

Before attempting to account for this phenomenon, it may be well to illustrate it first with examples so as to give a true idea of its nature and extent.

### 2.23.1 Names ending in -r:

1) [ʾim-r]: Akk. immeru “small cattle”; immertu “ewe”, CA ʾimmaru id., Ug., Phoen., Pun., BAram., Syr. ʾmr id.: Cush.: Saho, Afar maruu, maaruu “sheep”, Chad.: Tangale mara “goat”, Buli., Polchi mar id., Bokkos maray “ram”.

2) Egyp. ydr “stud cow or bull”, Cush.: Afar wadar “cattle”.

3) [ʾai-r]: Ug. ʾr “ass”, CA ʾairu “ass, donkey”, Sab. ʾyr in ʾr-n “caravan”, Aram. ʾēr “donkey”, Egyp. ʾy “ass”: Cush.: Kaficho awaroo “horse”, Mao wōore id.

4) [ʾW-r]: Egyp. ʾr “goat, ram”, Chad.: Montol ur “he-goat”, Kulere war id., Lele ōrē pl. “goat”: CA yaʾru masc. “kid of goats” (ML VI, 156); yuʾāru “the sound or noise uttered by a goat”, but, it is also said to signify “bleating (of sheep)” (LA). For prefixed /y-/, see §2.6 above.

5) [ʾiṣ-r]: Akk. iṣṣūru “bird”, Ug. ʾṣr, CA ʾuṣfūru id., etc.

Concerning CA ʾuṣfūru, Semitists (see Rabin 1975: 89, n. 6) consider it as a blend of ʾiṣṣuru + ṣippūru “a kind of bird”, while old Arab scholars (see Bin Faris ML IV, 369) correctly analyzed the word as being from ṣfr “chirp” (n. 33 below) with prefixed /ʾ-/. For the signification of proot [ʾ-], see §2.15 above.

6) Cush.: Som. aboor “termite”, Chad.: Gude mubəra id., Bachama mburey, Mwulyen muburu id.

7) [buḵ-r]: Akk. buḵāru “ox, cow”, Phoen. bḵr “cattle”, BHeb. bāḵār id., Syr., Mand., Jp. baḵrā id., CA baḵaru “cows, oxen”, SA, Tham. bḵr id.: Chad.: Tera bokəra “goat”, Bachama bogər-ey id., but comp. Chad.: Mafa ḵokw “goat”, Kera beke “cows”.

8) [bak-r]: Akk, CA bakru “young camel”, Tham., Sab. bkr, BHeb. beker id.: Brb.: Ayer, Tawlemet ebakar, Ahaggar ebəkər “lamb”, Semlal a-bukir “kid”.

9) [bʾ-r]: Akk., Assy. būrū “young bull”, CA baʾīru “beast of burden, ass”, but Old Tamīm dialect (by vowel harmony) biʾīr id., BHeb. beʾīr, Aram. beʾīrā “cattle, beasts”, SA bʾr “domestic animal, livestock”, Ge. bəʾrawi “ox”, Amh. bare id.: Cush.: Saho beʾer “bull”, Afar baʾeraa, Ometo booraa id., Bil., Xamir, Xamta biira id., Chad.: Gera bara “bull”, Cagu barēn id., Mokilko buru id. id.

10) [bar-r]: Akk., Assy. barbaru “jackal, leopard”: CA barrī “wild”.

11) [db-r]: OAram. dbrh “wasp”, CA dabbūru masc. id., Syr. debbortā “bee”, Jp. dibbōrītā id., BHeb. dəbōrā, Soq. ʾidbeher id.

12) [dud-r]: Akk. dudrū “a kind of small cattle”, CA dardāʾu [r. ddr] “aged she-

camel” (-’u = fem. suffix).

13) Chad.: Ndam də:gre “monkey”, Buduma gāgel id., Cush.: Som. daŋer id., Hadiya dagieraa.

14) Chad.: Ngamo dəkura “lizard”, Karekare dəkara id., Housa ɣa-dangara “lizard”, Cush.: Kaficho dingaro “lizard”, Gim dingar id.

15) Chad.: Sokoro dogol “elephant”, Dangla dugulu “trunk”, Cush.: Ometo dongor “elephant” may be related to Sid. daan-icco “elephant”, Hadiya daan-cco, Omotic dang “elephant”, Saho, Afar dakaano, Som. dagon id. Cush. words have infixes /-n-/.

16) Chad.: Mofu gwagwar “hen”, Kera guugur id., Cush.: Oromo gogorii “guinea fowl”.

17) [θau-r]: Akk. šūru “bull”, CA θauru, Ug. θr, SA θwr, BHeb. šōr, Syr. tawra, Palm. tōrā, Ge. sor id.: Chad.: Sokoro, Tumak tor “cow, antelope”, Housa tōrō “bull”.

18) Gen. Berb. her “small cattle”, CA hirr, a word used to drive small cattle and also invite them to fodder. It is also of the most common word for “cat”.

19) [kud-r]: Ug. kdr “vulture”, CA kudru “a kind of sand-grouse”.

20) [kur-r]: Akk. kerru “lamb”, BHeb. kar, Ug. kr “male lamb”, CA karākuru “herd of horses”, kurra-tu (pl.) “dung of small cattle (goats, sheep, lambs)”, kurru (rare, but common in all modern forms of Arabic) “young of an ass”, Chad.: Tera koro “ass, donkey”, Bolowa koro, Ngizim, Gude, Kabalay, Hwwona kwara id., Cush.: Ometo kuraa, Kaffa “ass, donkey”, prob. Chad.: Sura kar “monkey”, Angas ker id.

21) Berb.: Ayr, Tawlemmet i-kərkar “camels”, Sem.: Heb. kirkārā “she-camel”, CA kirkira-tu fem. “upper part of the chest (of a camel or she camel)”;

22) [muh-r]: Akk. mūru “foal, colt”, CA muhru id..

23) [ɣur-r]: CA ɣurra-tu fem. “frog”: Eyp. ɣrr id., Copt. krur id., Chad.: Mubi kirēni “frog”, Gava kire, Mofu kakəraŋ id.

24) Eyp. mr “cow”, Chad.: Mafa maray “sacrificial bull”, Sem.: CA māriya-tu fem. “wild cow”.

25) [nim-r]: Akk. nimru “leopard, panther”, CA nimru, namiru “tiger, leopard”, Aram. nmr, Syr. nemrā, BHeb. nāmēr, Sab. nmr “panther, leopard”, Ge namr “leopard”, Chad.: Bokkos, Sha, Dafu-Butura *murum* “hyena”.

26) [naš-r]: Akk. našru “eagle”, CA nasru id., Ug., Aram. nšr, BHeb. nešer, Syr. nešrā id., Eyp. nšr “hawk”.

27) Chad.: Fyer fiir “monkey”, Masa fira “monkey”, Gisiga vri, Lame vir id.

28) [pr-r]: Ug. pr “bull”, BHeb. par “young bull”, CA farīru “young of a cow”.

29) HEyp. ɣrr-t “serpent, worm” = CA ɣurru “a kind of snake (either “young of snake” or “gentle snake”)”, Chad.: Tumak hirə “snake”.

30) [ɣim-r]: Akk. imēru “ass, donkey”, Assy. ɣimāru, CA ɣimāru, Ug., Aram., Palm. ɣmr, Syr. ɣemrā (pl.), BHeb. ɣamōr, SA ɣmr id.

31) [huz-r]: Akk. huzīru “swine”, Ug. hnzr, Aram. ɣazirā, BHeb. ɣazir, Eth. hanzir id., CA hinzīru, also huzru pl. as in Poet.

«lā tafharunna fa’inna (’a)llāh ’anzalakum

yā huzra θa’laba dāra (’a)δ ḍulli wa (’a)l ’āri» (Al ’ayn IV, 207).

CA *hinzīru* is from the trilateral [hʒr] (Jamharah I, 583; ŞHH II, 644; LA, etc.), and it seems that the word is originally a description of the animal rather than a term for it. The

word is derived from *hazaru* “smallness and narrowness of the eye”; *’ahzaru* “one who looks askance”; *hazara* ~ *hanzara* “to look askance, leer”. Some other words sharing with [hʒr] the same origin are CA *hanzu-wānu* “swine, pig”, from *hanaza*, said of meat, “be stinky”; *hinwaṣu* “young of pig” (appears to be from *hwṣ* = *hazaru* in meaning), DAram. *ḥnyṣ* “young pig” (NWSI I, 388): Chad.: Housa *gunzū* “wild boar”, Dangla *kinzir* “big”, etc.

32) [hp-r]: Ug. *hpr-t* “(yearling) ewe”, CA *harūfu* masc. “lamb”.

33) [ʃip-r]: Akk. *šibāru* “sparrow”, Ug., BAram. *špr* “bird”, BHeb. *šippōr*, Syr. *šepprā* id., CA *šuffariya-tu* “a kind of bird”, Chad.: Wargla *čapur* “guinea fowl”, Margi, Bura *cəvur*, Kilba *civər* id., Sumray *sibir* id. (HSED, 103).

34) [ʃar-r]: Assy. *šaršaru* “grasshopper”, CA *šaršūru* “cockroach, cricket”, BHeb., Syr. *šrr* “cockroach”.

35) [ʃp-r]: Ug. *špr* “stag, buck”, BAram., Syr. *špr* “he-goat”.

36) Akk. *šīru* “serpent”. SL *šāra-h* fem. ~ *sāra-h* “a kind of lizard”.

37) Chad: Housa *šābiri* “a kind of bird”, Smr *sibir*, Sok *sōir* “guinea fowl”, Cush.: Som. *šimbir* “a kind of bird”, Oromo *šimbira*, *simbira* Berb.: Kabyl *-šbibir* “butterfly, small bird”.

38) [tai-r]: CA *ṭairu* “bird”, Syr. *ṭayrā* id.: Chad.: Gisiga *tūra* “partridge”. Berb.: Izayan *eṭṭir*, Izdeg *eṭṭir* “falcon” are from an Arabic dialect *iṭṭēr*, consisting of *iṭ* “the” and *ṭēr* ~ *tair* “bird”.

39) Berb.: Zenaga *war*, Nefusa *wār* “lion”, Zenaga *war*, Ghat *ā-bər* id., Chad.: Sura *mbər*, Angas *bwār* “lion”, Polchi *bwər* “hyena”, Mubi *bōri* id., Gisiga *mobor* id., Dangas *boori*, Migama *booru* “hyena”, Cush.: Som. *warab*, Oromo *warab-esa* “hyena”, Rendille *waraba* id.: CA *wabaru* “hair of camels, foxes, etc.” also “a kind of desert animal” as a vb “to wander and become savage or wild like animals”.

40) Chad.: Mesme *džēr* “locust”, Gisiga *zaray* “locust”, Sura *nžar* “termite”.

41) Cush.: Oromo *adurree* “wild cat”, Alagwa *že’ira*, Burunge *ži’rare* “viverra”, Kaffa *yeero*, *žāro* id., Chad.: Bachama *žara* “lion”.

42) CA *γufu* “young of deer”, Heb. *’ōper* “young gazelle”: Chad.: Angas *fir* “antelope”, Cush.: Kwadza *aful-atu*, Asa *’ofor-ok* “antelope”.

43) CA *zarzūru* “starling”, Chad.: Kariya *zarazar* “crow”, Gisiga *zorozoro* “vulture”.

### 2.23.2 *Names ending in -l:*

1) [’ig-l]: Akk. *agālu* “mule”, Assy. *agalu* “saddle-ass”, CA *’iglu*, Tham., Ug., Phoen., Aram. *’gl* “young bull, calf”, BHeb. *’ēgel*, Syr. *’eglā* id., Eth. *’egel* id.: Cush.: Agaw *gall-* “calf”, Bilim, Kwara, Kemant *gār* id., Ometo *gallua* id.

2) [’y-l] ~ [’wl]: Akk. *’ailu* “buck”, CA *’iyyalu* (pronounced *’iy-ya-lu*) or *’uyyalu*, Ug., Phoen., Pun., Sab. *’yl*, BHeb. *’ayyāl*, Syr. *’aylā* id.: Egyp. *’ir* “stag” (HED I, 2), Cush.: Som. *eelo* “deer”.

A phonologically similar word pronounced with one medial /-y-/ exists in HS as in Ug. *il* “ram”, Heb. *’ayil* id., Akk. *’ālu* “mythological bull”, Cush.: Saho, Afar *ille*, *illi* “sheep”.

3) [’ib-l]: Akk. *ibilu* “camel”, CA *’ibilu*, *’iblu* coll. “camels”, Tham. *’bl*, Sab. *’bl*, “camel”: Chad.: Lele *bila-he* “donkey”.

4) [buɣ-l]: Akk. buhālu “stallion”, Assy. buhalu “male beast”, CA baylu (masc.), Sab. byl “mule”. In addition to *bayl*, SL also has *nayl* “young of mule (lit. *son of mule*)”.

5) [bul-l]: CA bulbulu “nightingale”, Syr. bulbūl id., Tna. bālbāl belā “to flutter”.

6) [gam-l]: Akk., Assy. gammalu “camel”, CA ġamalu, BHeb. gāmāl, Aram. gml, Nab., Palm., Jp. gml, Syr. gamlā id., Sab. gml, Ge. gamal id.

7) [g’l]: CA gai’alu ‘female hyena’, distinguished from all other names of animals and common nouns in that it does not require the definite article /’al/ because it is self-identifiable, though some, esp. in Poet., used the definite article with it by analogy (LA).

8) Chad.: Gaanda ga’ila “egg”, Gabin ng’ele, Boka ngala, Tera nḡərli id., Cush.: Afar gə̀ləo id.

9) Chad.: Logone garia “antelope”, Tumak gəru id., Cagu gāre “oryx”, Mburku gāri id., Cush.: Ometo gaaraa “kind of antelope”.

10) [gd-l]: Ug. gdl-t “female head of large cattle”, CA ġādīlu “a kind of camel”.

11) [gz-l]: CA ġauzalu “young of pigeons”, BHeb. gōzāl “young of birds”. Syr. zuglā id.: comp. CA zaḡal “carrier pigeon” or zuylūlu “young of birds”.

12) [ḡam-l]: Akk. kalma-tu, by metathesis, “insect, louse”, CA ḡamla-tu “louse”, Sab. ḡml “insect, locust”, Aram. ḡml, Syr. ḡalmtā, Eth. ḡemāl “insect, louse”: Chad.: Buduma komāli “ant”.

13) [nam-l]: Akk. namālu, CA namla-tu “ant” (coll. namlu), BHeb. nemālāh id., Aram. nmlh id.

14) [naḡ-l]: CA naḡla-tu “bee” (coll. naḡlu), Tham. nḡl, BHeb. nāḡil “bees”: perh. Cush.: Agaw, Bilim laḡla, Qu. laḡla, Ch. lalā id.

15) [paḡ-l]: Akk. pūhālu “vigorous male animal”, Ug. pḡl “ass”, CA faḡlu “male of any large quadruped”, Meh. faḡl “male”, Mand. phl “male organ”.

16) [fy-l]: Akk. pīlu, Assy. pīru, CA fīlu “elephant”, BHeb. pīl id., Mand. pil id.

17) [raḡ-l]: Akk. laḡru, by metathesis, “lamb”, CA raḡlu (~ rahīlu) “female of small cattle” (and the male is ḡamalu), Aram. rḡl id., BHeb. rḡl “ewe, sheep”.

18) [ri’-l]: CA ri’lu “young (lit. son) of ostrich, esp. *of one year old*”.

19) [ɣuz-l]: Assy. uzālu “gazelle”, CA ɣazālu, Syr. ‘uzaylā id.

20) CA šiblu “cub of lion”: Cush.: Som. šabeel “leopard”, Chad.: Sura səḡel “wild cat”, Mupun səḡel, Angas sōl id.

21) Akk. šallalu “night bird”, CA šulšulu “pigeon, small bird”, Cush.: Sid. ɕululle “kite”, Iraqw cilili “cry of the hawk”.

22) Eth. wäyṭäll “gazelle”, Chad.: Kotoko wutēli, Logone. úteli, Musgoy úderi “gazelle”. CA ‘ayṭalu “flank”, perh. orig. “flank of a gazelle or deer”. PIP Imri’ Al Qays used it in this sense as in «*lahu ‘ayṭalā dabyin...*», *it has the two flanks of a gazelle*. There is, however, no evidence supporting the claim that the term signifies specifically “flank of a deer or gazelle”. At the same time, it is almost absurd to maintain that the term expresses a general meaning “flank”, which has never been used as such throughout the history of the language. The closest CA cognate is ṭalā “young of a padded or hoofed animal, such as gazelle and sheep” = Ge. ṭāli “she-goat” (*tilwu* “young of a mule”, hence as a verb *talā* “to buy *tilwu*”). All are from [twl] “young of (animal, tree, etc.).

23) [wab-l]: Akk. abilu “ram”, OAram. ybl id., Phoen. ybl “ram”, Pun. ybl “ram, sheep in general”, BHeb. yōbel “ram”, CA ’awābilu, pl., “offspring of sheep and camels” (the singular would be \*wabilu), perhaps originally “ram”: wabila-tu adj. (said of a sheep) “yearning to a ram”, Sab. h-wbl-t “animals taken as booty”, Chad.: Mafa bəlow “kind of ram”, Mokilko bilyo “buffalo”.

24) [wa’-l]: Ug. y’l “wild goat”, CA wa’lu “mountain goat”, BHeb. yā’el, Aram. w’l, Sab., Qat. w’l id., Ge. wə’əla, Tna. wə’ala, Amh. wala id. (Chad.: Geji wulli, ulli, Lele ol, Kabalay yilə “antelope”, Cush.: Som. ’awl-kii “gazelle”).

25) Egyp. y’r- t “snake, snake-goddess”; y’r’r-wt pl. “serpents”, Chad.: Dangla ’aalo “snake”, Jegu ’illo, Birgit ’eli id., Musgum wala id, Cush.: Som. ’olaa’ol “leech”, Ometo ule id.

26) Chad.: Brg. zuguli “monkey”, Cush.: Bilin žāggira “monkey”, Xamta ziageraa, Kwara žāgira, Kemant žegəra, Damot zagree id.

### 2.23.3 Name ending in -b

1) [dub-b]: Akk. dabbu, CA dubbu masc. “bear”, BHeb. dōb, OffAram. db, Jp. dubbā, Syr. debbā, Eth. debb id.: Egyp. db “hippopotamus”.

2) [δi’-b]: Akk. zību, CA δi’bu masc. “wolf”, fem. δi’batu, BHeb. ze’eb, Eth. ze’b, Palm. d’b, Mand. diba id., Syr. di’ba, dība: Egyp. d’b, s’b “wolf, jackal”, Berb. dib “jackal”, Chad.: Migama žebeya “hyena”, Bidiya žebey-gi id.

3) [δub-b]: Akk. zumbu, zubbu “fly”, CA δubābu coll. masc. (sg. fem. δubāba-tu), Ug. δbb, OAram. dbbh, BHeb. zəbūb id., Amh., Arg., Gur. zəmb, Har. zəmbi id.: Chad.: Kambatta zəmbib- “gnat, mosquito”, Tangale šombo “fly”, Fali Gili žiḃi “fly”, Berb.: Ayr a-zəb, Twl i-zəbb “fly”, Ahaggar a-hb id. and also has ə-zəbibibər “a kind of coleoptera”: CA zunbūru “a kind of stinging fly”. The word is ultimately from δubābu, though it is directly derived from zunāba-tu “the needle with which a fly and a scorpion stings”. Another derivative is zunābā “(like or similar to) mucus coming out or falling from camels’ nose” < δunābā id. The trilateral [δnb], with infixed /-n-/, is the root from which the most common HS word for “tail” is derived as in CA δanabu masc., “tail of an animal”; δunābā “tail of a bird”, etc. see §2.23.5, n. (i) below.

*It is true that a female animal (like lioness, tigress, cat, etc.) has, like the male, δanabu “tail”, but the term is always, perh. culturally, associated with the male.* It is probable that the association is derived from a concept that ‘tail’ adds further strength to an animal or a source of strength for some of them. The determiner (adj., demonstrative, etc.) used with a female animal’s tail is always masc. as in δailu-hā (δailu = tail masc. + -hā = “her” ṭawīlu masc. = “long”). A consideration of the semantic values connected with the feminine and masculine may help explain this cultural concept. Reinisch finds that<sup>259</sup>

*«In Bedawye, while the masculine also serves to express ‘Grösse, Ansehen und Energie’, the feminine in most cases expresses the contrary: ‘Kleinheit, Schwäche, und Passivität’».*

He also finds in the same language that

<sup>259</sup> Quoted by Castellino, 1975: 353, n. 3.



*«the names of inanimate things that are normally masculine are regularly made feminine to indicate a diminutive».*

In Galla, too, as Castelino (1975: 353, n. 3) notes

*«small animals are normally feminine, which carries a diminutive and pejorative values».*

In CA, too, some masculine nouns can be made feminine to indicate a diminutive meaning, such as baḥru masc. “sea”: buḥayra-tu fem. “lake”.

4) ḏa-b-: CA ḏabbu masc. “lizard”, Heb. ṣāb “turtule”, Meh. ḏōb, Shh. ḏob “lizard”. Wrong cognates cited by HSED, n. 581 are Chad.: ṣumbo “frog” and Cush.: Alagwa ḥembe’u, Burunge ḥambe’u “frog”. Chad. and Cush. words are cognates with CA ḏifda’u id.

5) [‘uḵ-b]: CA ‘uḵābu masc. “vulture”, Meh. ‘āḵāb, Shh. ‘eḵeb id.: Chad.: koḃi “kite”.

6) [γur-b]: Akk. āribu “crow”, CA γurābu masc., BHeb. ‘oreb, Mand. urb, Soq. ‘arib, Shh. eγereb id.: Chad.: Jegu gurb-aak “crow”, Bambala gurruba id., Sura ḡṛṛṛṛṛ “crow”, Ndam ‘agra id., Cush.: Iraqw ḥwa’ari, Burunge ḥwarariya “crow”.

7) [kal-b]: Akk., CA kalbu masc. “dog”, Ug., Phoen., OAram. klb, Syr. kalbā, Hatra klb, BHeb. keleb, Eth. kalb id.

The term for ‘dog’ appears in Hamitic language divisions as [kan] or [kr ~ kl] as in Berb.: Gua *cuna*, Cush.: Kaffa, Mocha *kunano*, Ometo *kana*, Mao *kano*, but in Saho *kare*, Arbore *ker* id., Chad.: Fyer *kʷeeṇ*, Mogogodo *kwehen* “dog”, Dangla *kanya*, Jegu *kany* id., but in Housa *karē*, Barawa *kāra*, Sayanchi *kara* “dog”, while in Logone *kāle* “dog” and Kuseri *kele* id. Apart from Semitic suffix /-b/, which marks the masc. gender as will be demonstrated below, the three variants [kal] ~ [kar] ~ [kan] are ultimately from one single proot \*kaw-n-, and Sem. /-l-/ seems to be from \*-n-. The addition of /-b/ to \*kaw-n- had the effect of changing \*-n- to /-l/, hence \*kanb- does not exist. *Is this stem ultimately related to gar-*, in CA *ḡarwu*, Heb. *gūr*, Syr. *guryō* “cub of dog”, Akk. *gerre* “wild animal’s cub”? It is to be born in mind that final /-w/ of CA *ḡarwu*, like that of *falwu* “foal” and many others = “small (masc.)”.

8) [wg-b]: Ug. ygb “some edible animal”: CA waḡbu “a water-skin made from the hide of a he-goat”. Another related word is waḡba-tu “meal”.

9) Egyp. sy’b “castrated animal for sacrifice”, s’b “ox”. Many other names are discussed below.

The data just set forth above show clearly that HS words for animals, birds, etc. share in common the final radical consonant /-r, -l, or -b/. The question naturally arises: *Can these radicals be associated with some definable meaning?* It seems evident that the radicals are added to different underlying uniliteral and biliteral roots to derive words referring to different kinds of animals. In this sense, the radicals in question have a referential function; that is, *they have some conventional and recurrent connection with the nonlinguistic circumstances in which they are used.* We can specify this connection by stating that /-r ~ -l/ stands for a member (or perh. ‘group’ or ‘individual’) of the ‘animal kingdom’ when suffixed to a root. The feminine is formed as follows:

a) From the masculine by adding /-t/, as in CA fa’ru “rat” > fa’ra-tu “mouse”, hirru “cat (masc.)” > hirra-tu (fem)”, Ug. pr “bull” > pr-t “cow”.

b) From a different root, as in Akk., CA 'atānu, Ug. 'tn, BHeb. 'ātōn “she-ass/donkey”, and CA nāḫa-tu, Akk. anaḫā-ti (pl.) “she-camel”.

c) Besides, sometimes the word may be collective as in the word *baḫaru* “oxen, cows” (in all Semitic except Akk.). In this case, the singular is formed by the addition of the feminine suffix /-t/ as in CA baḫara-tu “a cow”<sup>260</sup>, while the masculine singular is from a different root, e.g. /θauru/. Another example is CA naḥlu “bees” > naḥla-tu “a bee (fem.)”: ya-‘sūbu “prince of bees and their male”, while ri’lu “bee (masc.)” is *an ordinary male* and so is θaulu “male of bees” also coll. “bees”, etc.

### Comments

A word of caution is necessary here before going into detailed discussions of some representative members. Some of the words might have originally nothing to do with animals; they had first been extended to animals as descriptive terms and in the course of time they have become fixed on them. In addition, some names might have had endings other than /-r/ or /-l/, but they have later acquired the ending by analogy. An interesting example may be the Chadic word for ‘lion’ as in Hwona *lifāri* “lion”, Margi *ha-livari*, Kilba *lēvari*, Ghadames *’alvari*, Hildi *luvari*, Lam *ərvare*, Mandara *’uruvwəry*, Glv *’arvara* id., Sura *rəḫəl* “wild cat”, Matakam *laval* “hyena” (HSED, n. 1636), etc. All are from PHS \*lab- “lion” as in Akk. labbu “lion”, OffAram. lb’ id. (NWSI I, 562), Ug. lbit “lioness” (UG, 534), Sab. lb’ “lion” (SD, 81), CA labu’a-tu “lioness”, while labu’u obsol. “lion” is rarely used, Eyp. lbw “lion”.

On the other hand, Some Cushitic languages like Saho and Afar have a form lubaak “lion” terminating with /-k/. *Is /-k/ here a masc. ending* (see §2.23.11 below) or a different suffix, e.g. *a noun classifier*?

Comparison of SL word *wišt*<sup>261</sup> imper., said only of a dog, “go/move away!” with its probable cognates in other HS languages reveals the former presence of a suffixed proot \*[k]: Cush.: Sid. woši-ččo “dog”, Kam. woši-čču, Had. wuši-ččo, Oromo ušō, Bed. yas (DRS VII, 649), Berb.: ušša “greyhound”. The CA cognate seems to be *wāšiḳu* “a kind of dog”.

Cohen (VPHS, 197, n. 505) derives Berb.: So. *uskay* id. from a different root. As a

<sup>260</sup> As a rule, singular nouns formed from collective nouns are *always feminine*. The rule applies to all such singular nouns, hence *ṣaḥru* “rocks” > *ṣaḥratu*, *tuffāḥu* “apple trees” > *tuffāḥatu*, etc. see §2.9 above.

<sup>261</sup> SL *wišt* is based on [wiš-] or [wuš-], and that its final /-t/ is etymologically different from any suffixed /t/ examined so far. *Is it an imperative ending*? I have no way of knowing. But, I know for sure that /-t/ of *wišt* is not an isolated example. It is also seen in another important word: *bistu* imper., said only of a cat (fem. or masc.), “go/move away!”: *bissu* masc. “cat”; fem. *bissē*, from *bissa-tu* = Eyp. bs “leopard”; bs-t “female leopard” (EHD I, 223). This /-t/ is prob. the one seen in some CA words as in the reduplicated form *ḡawti ḡawti*, used to *call animals to drink*: *ḡiy’u* “drink(ing)”.

The question whether [-ḳ] is or is not a noun classifier presupposes that /-š-/ be from an earlier /-k-/, which has been either palatalized before /i/ or just changed to /š/ for ease of pronunciation since it is impossible to pronounce \*wākiḳu or \*wuki-ḳu.

matter of fact, Berb. *uskay* is also present in SL 'assak, *said only of a dog when it is ordered to attack s.o.*

**2.23.4** The foregoing discussion shows that /-l-, -r, and -b/ are suffixed to all types of roots (biliterals, trilaterals, etc.) at different stages to form words referring to, classifying, or describing 'animals'. It is most surprising to find that these same suffixes can also be added to certain biliteral and trilateral stems to change their semantic scope of application from 'human' to 'animal'. Comparison of the meanings conveyed by CA /šf/ and /šfr/ uncover the following illuminating fact: *šafa-tu* signifies "human's lip (tu = fem. sg.: Akk. *šap-tu*, etc. gen. Sem. id.)" and *mi-šfaru* "animal's lip" (MA, 218). It seems evident that the addition of -r to /šaf/ has the effect of changing its semantic features from [+ human, - animal] to [- human, + animal]. Additional examples are:

a) CA *ga'du*, said of man, "stout man", thus having the semantic features [+ human, - animal]. The addition of /-l/ to the word introduces two changes, one affects its classification, becoming quadrilateral, and the other modifies its semantic features, becoming [- human, + animal], thus *ga'dalu* means "stout beast of burden".

b) CA *ḥadabu* "hunchback"; 'aḥdabu "hunchbacked" (applies to human beings), while *ḥidbāru* "hunchbacked (applies to animals, like she-camel, donkey, etc.)"<sup>262</sup>;

c) CA *ḥadiḡu* "big-bellied (man)", while *ḥadāḡiru* "hyena", so-called because of its "big belly".

**2.23.5** In addition to animal-names, there are words in HS languages, notably in CA, having to do with all aspects of animal life, i.e. *with words denoting parts of the body of an animal, the different sounds they produce*, etc. many of such words end in -l-, -r, or -b. Some examples are:

i) CA *ḥanabu* (masc.) denotes "tail", Akk. *zimba-*, *zibba-tu*, Ug. *ḥnb-t* (note that CA does not make *ḥanab* fem. by adding -t, so it is always masc.), BHeb. *zānāb*, Eth. *zanaba*, Syr. *dūnbā*, Sab. *ḥnb id.*, Cush.: Som. *dib* "tail", *dabo* "tail, buttocks", Oromo *duboo*, Darasa "tail", Chad.: Hamar, Baa *doobanna*, Kar *dibini* "tail", Angas *tup* "tail", Gisiga *dəba* "buttocks, back", Mofu *duba* "back";

ii) CA *ziblu* "dung, manure", Ge. *zəbl- id.*, Akk. *zibl-* "waste, refuse", Syr. *zabbel*, "to manure (land)" (= CA *zabbala id.*), JAram. *zbl* "dung heap";

iii) Chad.: Montol *bulu* "horn", Dera *ḥili*, Tangale *ḥəl*, Karekare *ḥeelum id.*, Maha *bele-m id.*, Cush.: Gollango *baali* "horn";

iv) Eyp. *kr-ti* dual "horn", Cush.: kaffa *karoo*, Moch *karo* "horn", Akk., CA *ḥar-nu* "horn";

v) Akk. *naballu* "eagle's claw", Cush.: Som. *baal*, Oromo *baalal* "wing", Afar *bal* "feather", Hadiya *balla'a*, Sid. *balle id.*;

vi) CA *ḥāfiru* "hoof", *za'iru* "the distinctive sound uttered by a lion"; *ḥuwāru* "the distinctive sound uttered by cows", *ḥailu* "penis (of a beast of burden)", *ḡurmūlu* "penis (of a hoofed animal)", etc.

<sup>262</sup> SA: Meh. *ḥedēb* "hunch-backed", Shh. *ḥideb id.*

**2.23.6** It is worth-noting that the morpheme /-b/ differs from /r/ and /l/ in that the word in which it is final denotes a masculine singular animal. The following additional examples will light on this point: CA *hiḵbu* “male of ostrich”; *θu’bā-nu* “male of snake” (see §2.17.54 above); *ḵahbī* “male of partridge” also “young white male of cows and goats”, fem. *ḵahba-tu* (Al ‘Ayn III, 371); *ḥu(n)dubu* “male of beetle”; *ḥaušabu* “male of rabbit”; and *naizabu* “male of deer or cows”, *saḵbu* “young male of a she-camel”, *ḡa’bu* “rough male-ass of zebra”, *ḵurṭubu* “male of ogress”, etc. see below.

1) There is still one important morphological function of /-b/ which is to derive from a feminine word its masculine counterpart. This notable function of /-b/ is preserved intact only in CA. For example, “fox” is expressed in Akk. by *šēlebu*, Ug. *θ’lb*, CA *θa’labu*, Chad.: Musgum *čičelebe* “jackal”, Mokilko *sillibe* “wolf” (HSED, n. 464), but in some other Semitic languages, the cognate word lacks final /-b/ as in OAram., OffAram., etc. *š’l* (~ *t’l*), BHeb. *šū’āl*<sup>263</sup>, Meh. *yeθayl*, Shh. *iθ’ol*. The reason for this phonological difference is due to the fact that a gender distinction between “fox” and “vixen” was expressed in PHS by two forms:

a) /-l / denoting the feminine,

b) /-b/, denoting the masculine and derived from the feminine by suffixing /-b/.

These two distinct forms developed differently in Semitic languages, in some languages *the feminine* survives and in some others *the masculine*. This is, of course, not a hypothesis relating to Proto-Hamito-Semitic, but an unquestionable fact supported by concrete and unambiguous evidence drawn from CA. The language has preserved intact, just like nearly everything else, the two most ancient forms, together with their different plural forms:

*θu’ālu* “vixen”, pl. *θa’ālī*

*θa’labu* “fox”, pl. *θa’ālibu*.

LA (r. *θ’l*) states:

«both *θu’āla-tu* and *θu’alu* express vixen», and quotes Azhari as saying: «*θa’labu* is the male, and its female is *θu’ālah*, and their plurals are *θa’ālibu* and *θa’ālī* respectively».

Both terms co-occur in this proverb «*arwayu* (more cunning) *min* (than) *θu’āla-ta* (vixen) *wa* (and) *min* (than) *ḡanabi* (tail of) *θa’labi* (fox)»: cf. Nisābūri’s *Amthāl* I, p. 317, n. 1718. One should also note here that *ḡanab-* “tail” goes with the masculine as mentioned above.

2) A similar example is *’arnabu* as in Akk *arnabu*, *annabu* “hare, rabbit”, CA *’arnabu*, Ug. *’nhb*, OAram., OffAram., Syr. *’rnb* id., Jp. *’arnab-tā*, BHeb. *’arnebe-t* id. As for the gender of CA *’arnabu*, to LA [r. *rnb*], the word may be used as either masc. and in this case the fem. is formed from it by suffixing -t, i.e. *’arnaba-tu*, or used for both masc. and fem., and in this case the context determines its gender. In earlier dictionaries, however, the gender of the word is *masculine*, as defined by Bin Fāris (ML II, 443). In SL the word is always masculine and its feminine form is *’arnabeh* (final -h is a surface form of

<sup>263</sup> The masc. form appears in BHeb. in a place-name: *ša’alabīm* Judg. 1, 35, *ša’alabbīn* Josh. 19, 42 “(city of) foxes” (OT, 1078). This word has survived in a place-name in my hometown as *šal’abūn* or *ša’labūn* (with CA nom. pl. ending -ūn).

-t as in Heb., etc.). Again, Proto-Hamito-Semitic made a distinction of gender: *the feminine* was expressed by \*’un- and *the masculine* by \*’an-b (For the reconstructed forms, see below). All Semitic languages, again with the exception of CA, have lost all traces of the feminine form. CA has alone kept a significant trace of the former presence of this form. The word /’arnabu/ has two distinct plural forms:

- a) *one is ’arānibu, which is clearly the masculine plural of ’arnabu,*
- b) *the other is strangely ’arānī: comp. these two plurals with θa’ālibu and θa’ālī above (LA, r. rnb).*

The latter form is evidence of the former presence of a feminine singular form \*’urānu (reconstructed on the analogy of θu’ālu “vixen” above). Accordingly, it can be said that *the feminine* did not disappear entirely from the language since its distinct plural form still testifies to its former presence.

Evidence from CA also suggests that Semitic ’aḡrabu “scorpion” originally referring to “male scorpion”, and that the word is derived from a feminine form \*’uḡāru<sup>264</sup>: Akk. ’aḡrabu “scorpion”, BHeb. ’aḡrāb, Eth. ’aḡrab, Aram. ’ḡrb id., CA ’aḡrabu “male scorpion” with ’aḡraba-tu “female scorpion”. LA (r. θ’l) states that:

*«It is said: ’arḏun ma-θ’ala-tu, i.e. land abundant with foxes, as they say: ’arḏun ma-’ḡara-tu, i.e. land abundant with scorpions».*

Bin Faris rightly insists that the word is from [’ḡr], and ultimately from a stem [’aḡ] as in NWS t-’ḡh “injury, damage” (NWSI II, 1225).

3) In Bedawye, as reported by Castellino (1975: 336) «*indefinite nouns ending in a vowel can, however, take -b for masculine, -t for feminine...*».

4) This is, however, not all. Besides {θ’lb-θ’l} and {’rnb-’rn}, CA has also preserved some other words showing the same gender contrast: CA ’a-ḡṭabu [r. ḡṭb] “male of a wild she-ass” < ḡṭā’u “she-ass” (-ā’u is a fem. suffix as in ḡasnā’u fem. “beautiful”: masc. ḡasanu); CA ’unḡubu “locust (masc.)” < ’unḡu(wānah) “locust (fem.)”; ’alhabu “male of deer”, originally “male of ostrich” < ’ālhu “ostrich (fem.)”, θu’b-ānu: see §2.17.54, esp. n. 1 above.

For what concerns the origin of Semitic ’arnabu or ’annabu, evidence dictates that the word is from PSem. compound \*’annabu, with the first \*-n- dissimilating to /-r-/, becoming ’arnabu. For similar examples on dissimilation, see §2.17.80 above. The Egypt. cognate word is wn-t “hare”; Wnn- “a hare-goddess”.

5) If we want to say to a camel masc. “move away!, go away”, we should say ḡabu, which is also the term for ‘*masc. camel*’. For a she-camel, one should say ḡal “move away!, go away!”. There is no doubt that CA and its sisters should have had a number of affixed proots for expressing “female (of different species)”, a topic I will illustrate below.

**2.23.7** Before closing this section, it may be well to mention a different point of view on

<sup>264</sup> It is not a matter of chance *at all* that some very important feminine nouns have ‘a proot vowel /u/’ like ’ummu “mother”, ’uḡtu “sister”, ’unḡā “female”, and that CA ‘*feminine superlative of excellence*’ has the same vowel as in kubrā “biggest, greatest”, ṣuḡrā “youngest”, etc. It should be noted that CA diminutive forms- *no matter whether they are masculine or feminine*- also include this vowel as in §2.23.3, n. 3 above

the origins of final /-b, -r, and -l/. Diakonoff (1970: 461, ft. 23) hypothesizes that final /-b/ refers to *animals of prey* or *harmful animals*, final /-r/ refers to *useful animals*, and final -l to *wild useful animals*. Later on, Diakonoff (1975: 140) changes his mind and decides to consider /-l/ and /-r/ as «*suffix of nouns denoting animals used in production*».

There are, of course, so many apparent exceptions to this view. Diakonoff puts himself to strenuous and painstaking efforts to account ‘*scientifically*’, though through his own conception of the term ‘*scientific*’, for every single exception that may be found with the following statement:

«*Names of animals without these suffixes should probably be considered in Semitic either as epithets or as early borrowings*» (p. 24, ft. 24).

It seems that Diakonoff is so much obsessed with and sensitive to the concept of borrowing to such an extent that any variant pronunciation of a word in a Semitic language which does not fit the rule he himself prescribes is ascribed to borrowing, e.g.

«*Akk. bin-, also bun- “son” (isolated examples, mostly from lexicological texts, probably a borrowing); būr- “well” {< \*bu’r-} less frequently bēr < bi’r-; borrowing, etc.*» (p. 264).

The Akk. words ascribed to borrowing exist in CA as derivatives associated with grammatical meanings, e.g. *bin-* “son” and its dim. form is *bun-*. However, *diminutiveness* in this word and in some others, such as *bunaiyah* (bint “daughter”), *’umaimah* (’ummu “mother”) adds to the basic meaning a sense of ‘*affection*’, ‘*love*’, ‘*tenderness*’, and the like. In addition, CA *bi’r-* and *bu’r-* “well”, *dim. bu’airu* are not variants, but express different grammatical meanings. Moreover, when someone considers a word as borrowed, he *must* determine its source and justify fully his choice.

Finally, the existence of a language with datable records, whether in the past or present, whose words are pronounced exactly the same way by its speakers has not thus far been found or discovered on this earth. In brief, the writer’s view overlooks the fact that language constantly changes, and that this change is a necessary condition for the emergence of dialects, which in turn and in the course of time evolve into separate languages.

### 2.23.8 *Metathesis and Animal-names*

On the basis of facts established above, we often expect to see an animal name terminating in -l, -r, or -b. In some cases, however, metathesis took place in late PHS and, as a result, the radicals in question come to occur in medial position in daughter languages as in Akk. *ṣabītu*, Ug. *ḏby* “gazelle, deer”, CA masc. *ḏabyu*, fem. *ḏabyatu* id., OArām. *ṣby* id., Sab. *ḏbyt* “young she-camel”. Accordingly, this root is originally \**ḏai-bu* [\**ḏyb*] (see §2.12.1, n. 4b & ft. <sup>2</sup> above).

It is possible that HS word \*[\*ry ~ ’rw] “lion” is by metathesis from PHS \*’yr: Sem.: OArām., OffArām. ’ryh, Palm. ’ry’, Mand. ’rya, Syr. ’ryā, BHeb. ’aryē id.: Ge. ’arwē “wild animal”, Har. ūri, Amh. arwe id.: Cush.: Som. ar “lion”, Chad.: Mubi orūwa, Tumaḳ arəw “leopard”, Berb awar “lion”. VPCS (n. 34) and HSED (n. 56) cite Egyp. rw “lion” as cognate. Apart from the fact that Egyp. /r-/ in this word is represented with the

symbol /l-/, e.g. should be read lw, but that Egyptologists consider the symbol as representing /r-/ in this word (Gardiner, EG, 460). It is mostly likely that Egyp. lw is ultimately from the same root in Sem. lb' "lion", with /-b-/ > /-w-/.

Cohen (DRS I, 32) cites CA 'arwā "chamois, mouflon" as cognate. The real CA cognate is \*'ayru, which was once used to express "lion", has later become one of the common terms for "penis"<sup>265</sup>. The earlier meaning of the word has been preserved intact in the word za'īr (i.e. z'yr) "the characteristic sound produced by a (male) lion". *What is the etymology of initial /z-/, one may ask?*

1) CA and perh. other Semitic languages developed at a particular period of time a proot [za], perh. from earlier \*ġa, to express "sound, noise", and began to prefix it to words denoting animals. One of such words is CA 'ayru 'lion', another is baṭṭu coll. "duck" hence zaḇṭu "the characteristic sound or noise produced by ducks". A third example illustrating the same phenomenon is [γrd] "to chirp, warble, sing" (of a bird) also "warbler". Prefixing /za/ to this trilateral creates a quadrilateral [zγrd], which applies to *birds* and expresses the same meaning. It has also been extended to 'shout of joy' produced by women on happy occasions like *wedding*, etc. For an example from Semitic, see §2.11.61, n. b

2) In some rare cases we find devoicing of /\*-b/ as in Akk. alpu "ox", Ug., Phoen., OAram. 'lp, BHeb. 'elep, Eth. 'lf id.: CA 'alīfu "domestic (animal)": CA 'alfu "thousand", OAram. 'lp, Sab., Eth. 'lf, BHeb. 'elep id.: Proto-Semitic \*'al-bu, with \*'l- "cow" and \*bu = masc. ending. An ultimate connection between this proot and both \*'l- and \*lal- should be taken seriously. The former is seen in Akk.-Assyr. lū "wild ox"; littu "wild cow" = CA la'ā "wild ox"; la'ā-tu "(wild)cow", Chad.: Dera la "cow", Cush.: Saho, Afar laa "cattle", Som. loo' id. As for \*lal-, it seems to be a reduplicated form of \*'l- as evidence from CA suggests: la'la'a, said only of an ox or gazelle, "move its tail" = Akk. lalū "kid, goat", Ug. lla "kid", Soq. luloh "ewe", Cush.: Sid. Darasa, laalo "cattle", Kambatta laalu id., Oromo lal-eesa "she-goat".

### 2.23.9 Names ending in /š/ and /θ/

CA ḥinfīšu "a large speckled viper with a big head and, when is frightened or angry, it swells with rage" (LA). The definition suggests that ḥinfīšu is larger than ḥanašu, and that it is identical with ḥuffāθu masc. Moreover, Ibin Shamil confirms that ḥinfīšu masc. is a variant form of ḥuffāθu. It seems thus that ḥinfīšu is from ḥuffāθu, with the first /-f-/ dissimilating to /-n-/ (for examples on dissimilation, see §2.17.80 above). LA [r. ḥfθ] states that when a man is raged with anger, it is said: 'iḥranfaša ḥuffāθu-hu, i e., *it swells with rage, on the analogy of ḥuffāθu*, Egyp. ḥf-t "asp, viper, adder" (HED I, 479).

The passive 'iḥranfaša may suggest that CA had once an infix -r- used to form the passive voice<sup>266</sup>. To my knowledge, CA does not have a root [ḥrnfs], nor does it have

<sup>265</sup> Compare CA zabru "penis" and hizabru "hi- lion". For initial [hi-] and its signification in the given word, see §2.4 above.

<sup>266</sup> This phenomenon has brought to my attention other forms including infixed /-r-/. The

[ħnfš] (SL ħnfš exists)<sup>267</sup>.

The latter quadriliteral, as point out above, has been brought into existence, just like numerous others, as a result of dissimilation. A root [ħrfš or ħrbš], however, exists in the language as in *ħirfīš* or *ħirbīš* “a snake like viper with two horns”

Returning to CA *ħinfīšu* and *ħanašu*, final /-š/ in the first word seems to be from /θ/, and the sound change could be due to infixed /-n-/: CA *ħanašu* = Ug. nḥš “snake” (UG, 535), BHeb. nāḥāš masc. “serpent” (OT, 665), etc.

Proto-Semitic seems to have two additional suffixes indicating a distinction of gender: -š marks masculine gender and -θ marks the feminine. Visible reflexes of them are still seen in all Semitic languages. Accordingly, Semitic \*naḥaš- masc. consists of a proot \*na-ḥy- “serpent, snake” and a masc. suffix \*-š<sup>268</sup>. The compound \*na-ḥiy is ultimately from the notion “life, living”: OAram., OffAram. ḥwh “serpent” (NWSI I, 353), CA ḥaiyatu id. Therefore, CA [ħfθ] originally refers to a female snake, and consists of a proot \*ḥaf- (cf. Egyp. ḥf-t “viper, adder” above) and a feminine suffix -θ. The gender contrast is still evident in Semitic [’nš] masc. “human being” versus [’nθ] fem. “human being” and in CA *fadsu* masc. “spider” and \*fadθu > *fadšu* (for seq. const.) fem. “spider” = Egyp. *ptt* “scorpion”, Chad.: Higi-Futu *ptu* id., HB *wto* id., Fali-Kiri *ti* id. (HSED, n. 2028). Some other examples are CA *hunθā* or *mu-ħannaθu* and *du’būθu* (LA) both end in /-θ/ and used to describe a man ‘having the characteristics of a female’.

Another term for ‘spider’ in Semitic is seen in BHeb. ‘akbīš masc., “spider”, BAram. ‘kbt id. Gesenius (OT, 776) also cites CA ‘ankabūθu, with infixed -n-, as cognate. The word, as it stands, is difficult to pronounce mainly because of the presence of infixed -n-, it is usually pronounced ‘*ankabūtu*, with \*/θ/ becoming /t/ for ease of pronunciation. It expresses “female spider”, while ‘*ankabu* “male spider”, pl. ‘*anākibu*. All are from a proot \*ak- > ‘ak- + -b masc. “spider” and {‘ak + -b} + -θ fem. “spider”. One may note here that Semitic languages derive fem. {‘kbθ}, as we may not expect, from the masc. {‘kb}, and not from the root.

CA also has \*ak- > ‘uk- + -s masc. > CA ‘*ukāsu* “male spider” but \*uk- + \*-θ fem. > \*ukāθu → ‘*ukāšu* for seq. const., also expresses “male spider” or “spider”, according to LA (r. ‘kš)<sup>269</sup>.

---

quadriliteral [ġrθm], for example, expresses, as in ‘iġranθama pass., said of people, “to gather together and stick to a place or *earth*” (LA, r. ġrθm). The quadriliteral [ġrθm] is definitely from [ġθm] as in ġaθama “to crouch, cleave to the ground or *earth*” < ġaθā id. We may note from these examples and many others that the presence of /-r-/ is conditioned by the infix /-n-/. Since the /-n-/ is a passive affix in the language, it is most likely that the passive idea is expressed here by /-n-/, and that the presence of /-r-/ is perhaps due to dissimilation.

<sup>267</sup> It signifies ‘swell, stand erect (penis)’ and is seemingly based on *faš* “swell”.

<sup>268</sup> A similar word ending with /-t/ is ḥayūtu “male snake”: ḥaiya-tu “female snake”.

<sup>269</sup> Consider the following example: CA *dabā* coll., a term for a type of *locusts* > *dabāsā* coll. “female locusts”, sg. *dabīsā*’a-tu. A third trilateral [dbš] as in *dabaša*, said of locusts, “make the



## 2.23.10 Names ending in -m, and -n

Besides animal names ending with /-l/, -r, or -b/, there is a very small number of names ending in either -m, -n, or -s/-z.

a) /-m/ CA būmu “owls”, Syr. būmā, Mand. bum id.; CA ʔanamu coll. “sheep”, Tham. ʔnm id.; CA ʔaramu “small kids” (: ʔira-tu “a sheep”, pl. ʔāru, both from [r. ʔwr] ~ ʔarāru pl. [r. ʔrr] id. ~ waʔīru id. [r. wʔr]. We have earlier (see §2.1.13 above) drawn attention to this phenomenon.

b) /-n/ Akk. šēnu, CA ʔaʔnu “small cattle”, Ug. šʔn id., BHeb. šōʔn id., Phoen. Pun., Aram., Palm. šʔn, Sab. ʔʔn id.; Akk. zizānu “reptiles”, BHeb. zīz “moving things”, but in CA zizānu is the pl. of masc. zīzu “cicada”;

c) There are still some names terminate with /-s/ and /-z/ as in CA ʔīsu “camels”; ʔūsu coll. “a kind of sheep”, ḥūsā “herds of camels”; BHeb. rekeš “steeds”, OffAram. rkš id. (= CA raksu “a group of people”); Akk. enzu “goat”, Phoen. ʔz, Ug. ʔz “goat”, but in Sab. ʔnz, coll. “goats”, while the form is sg. fem. in CA ʔanzu “she-goat” (Al ʔayn I, 356; LA). The earlier meaning may be “a type of she-goats”.

With the notable exception of [ʔanz-], [ʔaʔn-], and [kar-m- + its variants], all terms above are orig. either descriptive, imitative, or derived from notions having orig. nothing to do with animals. It is possible that the collective idea expressed by some of them is due to /-m/ and /-n/ since both are plural suffixes in Semitic languages (Gray, 1971: §197; O’Leary, 1969: §123). It is also equally possible that such names are originally broken plurals formed from the singulars by ablaut (*‘internal vowel change’*) as in CA rasūlu “messenger” > pl. *rusulu*, baytu “home” > pl. *buyūtu*, and ḡabalu “mountain” > pl. *ḡibālu*. Later, for some reasons, the singulars fell into disuse and eventually disappeared. *Both possibilities should, however, be dismissed since nearly all words for ‘animals’, ‘plants’, ‘trees’, etc. are coll. in the language.*

1) It is important to note that /-m/ and /-n/ may appear as prefixes in a number of words as in CA maʔzu ~ miʔzā ~ māʔizu “goats” (Koran 6: 143), ESA mʔzy “goats” (1962:14) and CA niʔāḡu “ewes”, Chad.: Angas nūḡ “cow”, Sura niḡ, Montol nung “cow” (HSED, n. 1832). Although the /m-/ in maʔzu *may be* a plural morpheme, yet the /n-/ in niʔāḡu may or may not be as such since the word conforms to one of the patterns of broken plurals, namely FiʕāLu: cf. ḡamalu “camel” > pl. ḡimālu, saḡmu “arrow” > pl. siḡāmu, nablu “arrow, dart” > nibālu.

2) If \*ni- in niʔāḡu is a *fem. plural morpheme* then, logically speaking, *it must be found in some other words performing the same function.* Our strong believe in this case as well as in all other similar cases is that the *human mentality which adds an affix to a given stem or root for any linguistic purpose one may think of* (derivation, inflection, etc.) *must also add this same affix to some other words and roots in the language for the same purpose.* Accordingly, in order to determine with certainty whether /ni-/ is a plural

---

earth grassless”.

morpheme or not, we must find and study some words in the language sharing with *ni'āġu* the same linguistic features, namely *fem.* & *pl.*

Let us take the word *nīsā'u* (~ *niswatu*) “women” «*the plural form of 'imra'a-tu* “woman” *from a different root*» as defined in LA [r. *nsy*]: cf. Sab. *mr't*, OAram. *mr't* “lady, divine woman”<sup>270</sup>, etc. Old Arab lexicographers and grammarians derived the word from the root [*nsy*] “to forget” = OAram. Phoen. *nšy*, BHeb. *naša(h)*, etc. id. (§2.11.30 above), but its true cognate in Semitic seems to be OAram. *nšy* “women”. The OAram. sg. form, however, is *'šh* “woman”, a form without /n-/, derived from *'š* “man” by adding the usual fem. suffix \*-t (or surface -h) = BHeb. *nāšīm* pl. of *'išā* “woman” (OT, 700). Thus OAram. *nšy* is not a derivative of [*nšy*] “to forget” and, consequently, it may or may not be cognate with CA *nīsā'u*.

CA *nīsā'u* “women” has indeed nothing to do with [*nsy*] “to forget”. It has been added to this root upon the adoption of the plural affix \*-n- as part of the word. Like its OAram. cognate, the word is derived from CA *\*'āsu* “man” (= OAram. *'š*), preserved in a number of compound words such as *ba-'su* “strength, might”, from *\*bin-'āsu* “son of man” > “man” = Ug. *bnš*, Eth. *be'esī* id. (see §2.17.5 above). Based on these facts, we may conclude that CA *nīsā'u* and OAram. *nšy* are cognates, and that CA *nīsā'u* is from *\*ni-'isā'u* and its variant *niswatu* from *\*ni-'is-wa-tu*, thus each containing more than one plural affix.

3) I admit that *\*ni-* is a prefix, but I am reluctant to accept it as a plural prefix. Sibawayhi, however, consider *nīsā'u* as the pl. of the pl. *niswatu*, i.e. if pl. *niswatu* are or become numerous then they are referred to as *nīsā'u* (LA). Syntactically speaking, the term *niswatu* is thus جمع قلة ‘*the plural of paucity* (or ‘fewness’)) and *nīsā'u* جمع كثرة ‘*the plural of abundance*’. To my knowledge, CA has no stem with /ni-/ expressing ‘*plural of paucity*’, though it has a plural stem terminating with -n as in *niswānu*, another pl. form of the pl. *niswā-*. Wright (1962: §307) finds that among the plural stems denoting the *plural of paucity* are XII *Fi'Latu*, XIII *'aF'uLu*, XIV *'aF'āLu*, and XV *'aF'iLatu*, and that such stems «*are used only of persons and things which do not exceed ten in number* (i.e. 3 to 10)». Ibin Aḳīl cites the stems in a verse of poetry:

«'aF'iLatu-n 'aF'uLu ṯumma Fi'Lah

ṯummata 'aF'āL'u, ġumū'u ḳillah» (Sharh Ibin Aḳīl II, 452).

Ibin Duraïd (Jamharh III, 1334) adds *Fi'Lāt*, *Fu'Lāt*, e.g. *plural of abundance* *ruṭabu* “ripe dates”, *plural of paucity* *ruṭabātu*, sg. *ruṭba-tu* fem., etc.

It seems to me that PHS undoubtedly had a morpheme or a number of morphemes expressing ‘*plural of paucity*’. The only morpheme I am sure of its earlier presence in the family is /ni-/ as in CA *nīsā'u* and *ni'āġu* above. This same morpheme is seen, I believe, in Egyp. as in *ng(')*, defined by Gardiner (EG, 576) as “a species of bull”, and by Budge as “bull” (EHD I, 397-398). The word is a compound of *\*n-* “few, a class of” + *g(')* “bull”. We may go further to give a more precise definition of *\*n-* as ‘*few or class of things, persons or animals that are homogeneous*’. In SL as well as in CA *niswatu* actually means ‘some or few women’.

<sup>270</sup> The signification of OAram., Sab. *mr't* was common in early Islamic CA (LA).

4) Proto-Semitic **\*anzu** is both interesting and perplexing for a number of reasons:

4a) It is collective in some languages (Sab **\*nz**), singular in some others (Akk. **enzu**), and fem. sg. in CA.

4b) The form appears with **-n-** in some languages (cf. in CA, Sab, OAram., and Akk.) and without **-n-** in some others (cf. Ug. **\*z** “goats”, Phoen. **\*z** “goat”). A form without **-n-** is also seen in CA in compounds and also in the reduplicated **\*az’az**, said of goats, imper. “go away!”, **\*az’aza**, said only of goats, “to turn away, move aside”.

4c) The form appears without **/-n-/** and with prefixed **/m-/** and still plural in some languages as in CA **mā’izu** “goats”, ESA **m’zy** id. above, Palm. **m’zyn**, the tribe/clan of *bny ma’zyn*, as originally *the tribe of the goat-herds* (NWSI II, 668). The Palm. phrase = CA **banī ma’āzīn** “the tribe of (the) goat shepherds”: CA **ma’āzu** “one who has, herds, and tends goats” and final **/-īn/** = Palm. final **/-yn/**), is a pl. ending. Thus, both CA and Palm. words are derived from **/ma’zu/** “goats” according to the pattern **/FaʿġālLu/** (cf. CA **laḥḥāmu** “butcher” < **laḥmu** “meat”, **baḳḳāru** “one who herds and tends cows” < **baḳaru** “cows”, etc.). We may conclude:

4d) CA and ESA **[m’z]** is a compound of **\*m-** and **\*’az-** “goat”. The first element of the compound is certainly *not* a pl. marker. The second element consists of **[’aw]** “goats, goats and sheep” (see n. 4f below) and **\*-z**

4e) Proto-Semitic **\*’nz-** is a compound of three elements: a root **[’w]** “goats (and sheep)”, an infix **\*-n-** (?), and ending **\*-z-**.

4f) Evidence proving the correctness of our analysis of **[’nz]** above comes from both CA **[’ws]** as in **\*ūsū** “a kind of sheep (coll.)” and Egyp. cognate **\*wt** “sheep and goats, small cattle, flocks” (EHD I, 114; EG, 557), also in a phrase **\*w-t-nb-** etc. “all kinds of four footed beasts” (nb = “all (kinds)”). Egyp. and CA words seem to be from PHS **[’aW-]** “a goat or a sheep” as in Egyp. **\*-t** “a goat”, Chad.: Gisiga **\*’aw**, Balda **\*’awa** “she-goat”, Cush.: Iraqw, Alagwa, Burunge **\*aw** “bull” (HSED, n. 1077).

Further evidence comes from CA **\*aw’ā** or **\*aw’aya**. LA and other lexicographers derive the words from a root **[’wy]** (and not from **[’w’]**, as we should expect), “to call on sheep or small cattle to move”: **\*uwwa-tu** fem. “sound” (Jamharah III, 1275). *Is the word a compound of \*awā “to utter a long sound, howl”; \*auwa-tu “sound, noise, tumult” and \*’ā “sheep”? The answer has to be yes: SL ma’ā-t, said ‘only’ of a she-goat or sheep, “to bleat”.*

Cognates are Har. **\*aw** “loud voice”, **\*aw bāya** “to shout, scream”, Ge. **\*awyāwā**, Tna. **\*away bālā**, Gaf. **\*yāyā**, etc. (HED, 37), Mand. **\*awa** “to howl, cry” (MD, 9), and possibly Cush.: Som. **\*i** or **\*iyy-** “to cry (animals)”, Bayso **\*iy-**, Oromo **\*iyy-** “to cry” (HSED, 248).

Shifting the radicals of **[’wy]** gives rise a new triliteral **[w’y]** in CA “tumult, noise (usu. of dogs)”, **wā’iya-tu** fem. “wailer” also “lamenting a dead person, announcing the death of a person”: comp. **nā’iya-tu** fem. “wailer”; **na’yu** “announcing the death of a person”, Egyp. **w’y** “to cry out, to conjure” (EHD I, 154).

6) In conclusion, Sem. **[’nz]** includes an infix **/-n-/**, which is due to the assimilation of PSem. **\*-w-** in **\*’aw-zu** to either **\*an-zu** or **\*az-zu** upon the addition of suffixed **/-z/**. This plainly tells that CA **\*nz**, **\*ws**, and Egyp. **\*wt** (in 4f above) go back to a PHS compound of

[‘aw-] “small cattle, i.e. *goats*” plus a suffix phonetically different from CA /-z/, /-s/ and Egyp. /-t/; it is the fem. /-θ/ (§2.23.9 above).

## 2.24 FOREIGN WORDS IN CLASSICAL ARABIC

For the sake of *truth* against falsehood, for the sake of *objectivity* against subjectivity, for the sake of *scientific research* against non-scientific research, and for the sake of *knowledge* against ignorance, I endeavor to write on this topic.

As a matter of fact, every language in the world has been more or less influenced by other languages, specially its neighbors, and CA is no exception. Jespersen (1964: 208) rightly insists on the fact that

«No language is entirely free from borrowed words, because no nation has ever been completely isolated. Contact with other nations inevitably leads to borrowings, though their number may vary very considerably».

**2.24.1** Some old Arab scholars investigated loanwords in Classical Arabic and made references to this phenomenon by describing some words as being ‘*non-native*’ or ‘*borrowed from foreign languages*’. They recorded their observations either in their dictionaries or in a section of their books. Khalil Bin Ahmad’s eight volume dictionary *Al ‘Ayn*, traced many Arabic words to foreign origins like *sukurqa*’ obsol. perh. “a kind of beer” (II, 348), *dahlīz* “underground corridor, cell” (IV, 123), *muhandis* “engineer of water channel”, nowadays “*engineer*” (IV, 120), *dahnaġu* obsol. “a kind of (green) pebble” (IV, 116), *manġanīk* obsol. “mangonel” (V, 243), *ķirmiz* “red dye” (V, 255), *biṭrīk* “leader (of the Roman army in *Shām*, i.e. *Greater Syria*), master” (V, 257), nowadays ‘*patriarch*’, *numruk* “pillow” (V, 265), *lukku* obsol. “red dye” (V, 280), *kurġu* obsol. “kind of game” (V, 288), *muṣṭukā* “chewing gum” (V 303), *misku* “perfume” (V, 318), *kūs* obsol. “triangular-shaped wooden instrument used by a carpenter”; *kausu* obsol. “drawing” (V, 392), *daraza* “to sew” (VII, 356), *nāṭiru* “keeper (of plantations, vineyards, etc.)” (VII, 413), *simsāru* “broker” (VII, 255), *ṭunbūru* “drum, harp” (VII, 472), *barbaṭu* obsol. “a kind of game” (VII, 472), *’iṣṭabl* “stable (of a horse)”, taken over from *Shām*, nowadays spelled *’iṣṭabl* (VII, 180), *bandu* obsol. “trick, cunning” (VIII, 52), etc.

**2.24.2** The list of foreign elements cited above was progressively expanded by old Arab scholars, with each making efforts to enlarge the list with new words. Among such scholars are Abu Ubaidah Ibin Sallam (157-223 H) in *Al-ġarīb Al-Muṣannaf*; Ibin ḳutaibah (died 276 H) in his *Adab Al-Kātib*; Ibin Durayd, 223-321 H (Jamharah III, pp. 1322ff, 1691ff), who cited about five hundred words believed to be taken over from Persian, Aramaic dialects, and Rūm (pronounced *Room*), an old term used to refer to Greeks, but it also refers to Romans; Tha’ālibi (died 430 H) in *Fiqh Al-Luġah* (p. 274ff), etc. One of the earliest works to deal exclusively with borrowing was that of Abu Maṣṣūr Jawālīqī (died 465 H) entitled *Al Mu’arrab* (Arabized words), which was revised and expanded by Ibin Barry (died 499 H) in his *Hāshiyah*.

On the other extreme, there are some other old Arab scholars who sharply denied any borrowing in CA. This stance should be interpreted as a natural reaction to some old Arab scholars’ deficient approach to borrowing (see §2.24.3 below). For an important survey of old Arab scholars’ views and works on borrowing, see Siyyūti’s *Al-Muzir* II, 268ff., who himself wrote *Al-Muhathab* in which he investigates loanwords in the

Koran.

**2.24.3** Arab scholars set forth *three criteria* for determining a foreign element in their language:

- a) *Transmission* نقل,
- b) *Non-conformity to the patterns and rules of the language which they themselves established,*
- c) *Phonotactics.*

Accordingly, a word is considered non-native if (a) a scholar, called *Imām*, i.e. *a grammarian or lexicographer*, ‘pronounces’ it as a loanword, (b) *it does not fit into any of the patterns they themselves established for the language*, or (c) *it contains an impermissible sequence of two consonants like an initial /n-/ followed by /r-/ as in nargīsu or the co-occurrence of /ʃ/ and /ġ/ in a word as in ’iġġāṣu pl. "pear" (Muzhir I, 270).*

Of these three criteria, the first was by far the *only effective and influential criterion* since it accounts for nearly all supposed foreign words in the language. It is evident that *Imām’s judgment on any word spells its doom, and is apparently as holy as any verse in the Koran, if it is not holier.* With the tentative exception of the last criterion *only* for a moment (see 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph below), this approach is subjective in the best sense of the word, since it requires us to accept without thinking all conjectures and surmises it proposes. We reject the approach not only because it is subjective, but also because its deficiencies have often confused native with non-native words.

In addition, the last criterion, i.e. *phonotactics*, can only apply to some or very few, but never to all concerned words. Accordingly, *it is unreliable.* Jawhari (ṢHH III, 1029, ft. 1) sees that *the criterion does not take into consideration sound changes resulting from interchanges of consonants having the same or similar point of articulation.* Azhari (see Muzhir I, p. 271) disproves the assumption that /ʃ/ and /ġ/ can’t co-occur in native words by citing some native words in which they co-occur like ġaṣṣa “open its eyes (whelp)” (see §2.6.13 above) and ġaṣṣaṣa “to fill with water”. Moreover, the unconditional interchange of /s/ and /ʃ/ (§2.2.48 above) makes the criterion utterly invalid.

1) As is known well, Arab philologists considered CA as a holy, pure and perfect language which needed to be preserved in harmony with the Koran and safeguarded from any future misuse and decay. The concern with purism and eloquence led them to codify the language on the basis of (1) *the Koran*, (2) *Koraysh dialect of Mecca*, (3) *pre-Islamic poetry and proverbs*, and (4) *the language of the desert*, and to exclude whatever they regarded as *colloquialisms, foreign elements, and faulty speech* (cf. Chejne, 1969: 40).

To get rid of any form of speech that did not conform to their rules, it was quite sufficient for Arab philologists to refer to it as *dialectal, faulty speech, or foreign element.* Azhari (282-370 H.), for example, *confessed in the introduction to his dictionary Tahdīb Al-luyah that he excluded a huge body of words from his dictionary* (see ‘Introduction to ṢHH, p. 85). The only reason, I believe, was because the excluded words did not fit the patterns and the rules, which had already been firmly established

for the language by his predecessors *Farāhīdī*, *Sibawayyihī*, and others. *Thus the study of loanwords in Classical Arabic was never done for its own sake.* This also holds true for the study of *old dialects*. For example, the word *yarū'u* meant “terror” (see §2.6.2 above), from *rā'a* “to terrify, frighten” does not fit any of the grammarians’ patterns or stems, for there is neither a nominal pattern *yaFūLu* in the language nor a prefix /y-/ expressing this grammatical function. Instead of studying the prefix, they treated it as part of the trilateral. LA (r. yr') quotes Azhari as saying:

«*yarū'u* is a dialectal form we need not remember, spoken by the tribe of *Shahr*, and it seems to mean “terror, dismay”».

Moscatti (1969: 132) finds that «*we are unable to penetrate to a stage preceding the considerable measure of systematization to which the language (CA) has been exposed*».

**2.24.4** The modern period has witnessed a growing interest in the study of foreign influences on CA, and a large number of books have appeared since late 19<sup>th</sup> c. One basic characteristic feature of such books is that all have been stuck to the erroneous views of old Arab scholars on most Arabic words, esp. *on Jawālīkī's views in Al Mu'arrab* above, and that all lack of scientific criteria for determining loanwords. As a matter of fact, the *only criterion* they have used is that of old Arab scholars, namely, ‘*transmission*’ or نقل. Finally, all have dealt with CA as a language with no dictionaries to consult, forgetting that CA is the first world’s language to have a standard dictionary in the best sense of the term. By far the most important and influential work on loanwords has been Siegmund Fränkel’s *Die Arämaischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen*, appearing in 1886, reprinted in 1962. After leaving no stone unturned, Fränkel includes in his work not only nearly all Arab and Western scholars’ conjectures and surmises, but also his own conjectures and fancy suppositions.

Fränkel’s views were followed blindly by some writers like Rafail Nakhla in his *Gharā'ib Al-Luyah Al-Arabiyyah* (in Arabic). In the first edition (1954) the number of loanwords was 521 and in the second it was surprisingly raised to 2515. As it will be shown clearly below, the book manifests, *exactly like* all other books on the subject, *incredible ignorance of CA*, of its history, of its dictionaries, of its nature, of the meanings of its words, of the family of language to which it belongs, and so forth, to such an extent that one really wonders why this man has chosen to write on a subject he is utterly ignorant of. A similar work entitled *Persian loanwords in Arabic* (in Arabic) is written by *Addi Shir* (1990, 1<sup>st</sup> published in 1908) and dealt, as its title suggests, with words coming into Arabic from Persian. There are many other works on this subject all similarly written by people who have nothing to do with the field of linguistics or Arabic linguistics, and all similarly manifest incredible ignorance of CA. To deal effectively with this subject, a deep knowledge of Classical Arabic is a must and, above all, objectivity is *prerequisite*.

**2.24.5** Before pronouncing a judgment on whether a Classical Arabic word is a loan or not, we must first ascertain all the historical facts available with regard to the word as follows:

(a) *Its earliest known use and signification.*

(b) *Checking on whether it has cognates in Hamito-Semitic languages or not, taking into account all common types of sound change that a language may undergo in the course of time.*

(c) *Examination of the general idea denoted by the root to which it belongs and its possible relation to other kindred roots.*

This is, however, *only one part of the task*. The other part is *to apply strictly all those procedures to any foreign word one may think of as the source of an Arabic word, i.e. if one assumes that a Greek word, for example, is the source of a given CA word, he should first and before all prove that the Greek word is Indo-European*. Only with such scientific measures one can rise above loose conjectures and present to the world an objective and scientific study.

**2.24.6** In what follows, we will illustrate the scientific measures as outlined above with suggestive rather than exhaustive examples drawn from different writers' works on this subject.

Nakhla writes in his introduction to loanwords in Arabic:

«...However, I have read with a critical eye the most famous books dealing with loanwords in Arabic (i.e. the works of Jawāliqī, Addi Shir, and Fränkel), and I have included in the following lists not only those words which I am certain of their foreign origins, but also many new discovered loanwords» (p. 169).

In what follow, we will put to the proof the depth of his *critical insights* and of his *knowledge* of the language he is investigating its loanwords.

**2.24.7** CA *muddu* “a measure” is detected by Nakhla’s *critical eye* as a loan from Latin *modius* id. (p. 280). CA *muddu* is from PSem. \*mdd “to measure; a measure”, as in Akk., Ug., Aram, etc. gen. Semitic *mdd* id.

**2.24.8** CA *ḡuffa-tu* fem. “basket” is traced by Nakhla ‘with absolute certainty’ to Latin *cophinus* (p. 279). CA *ḡuffa-tu* is from PSem. \*ḡpp “basket” as in Akk. *ḡuppu*, Ug. *m-ḡpp*, etc. gen. Semitic id.

**2.24.9** CA *ḡauru* “bull” is found by Nakhla (p. 256) to be a *doubtless loan* from Greek *tavros* id. The CA word is from PSem. \*ḡauru as in Akk. *ṣūru*, Ug. *ḡr*, ESA *ḡwr*, etc. gen. Semitic id.

**2.24.10** With ‘unmatched sagacity and keen perception’, Nakhla (p. 277) traced CA *bāriḡa-tu* “warship” to late Latin *barca* id. He, for a reason we have no way of knowing, did not want the Latin word to enter directly CA dictionary and apparently preferred to take it first on a sailing trip to Turkey, where it established for itself a permanent residence in Turkish dictionary as *bartcha*. Later, devout *bartcha* took a pilgrimage to Arabia and, perhaps, spiritually felt attached to the place, so it decided to establish another permanent residence in Arabic dictionary. If Nakhla studied the etymology of the CA word and had just very little knowledge about the history of the Turks, he would



certainly find that the word had been in use in CA for many centuries before the coming of the Turks to the Middle East. The etymology of this pure CA compound word will be uncovered in §2.24.29, n. 2 below.

**2.24.11** Nakhla cites other Turkish words in MSA and modern Arabic dialects: ‘araba-tu “car” (p. 273) and all words on pages 274-276. All such words in their entirety are Arabic in all details. The meaning given to each CA by Nakhla reveals not only ignorance, but also a great deal of fondness of twisting facts and fabricating lies.

1) For example, according to Nakhla, *ḥaḍ* (he uses the Arabic script) means in the Arabic loanword in Turkish “joy, happiness” and this meaning, according to Nakhla, was re-borrowed by Arabic *ḥaḍ*, which originally expressed “share” (p. 275). Two facts should be born in mind in this concern:

a) CA *ḥaḍ* “share” is secondary, developed from the notion of “luck, fortune”, which is the basic lexical meaning of the word in CA and in all other Semitic languages, as well as in MSA and in all Arabic dialects: CA *ḥaḍḍu* “luck, fortune”; *maḥḍūdu* “lucky, fortunate”, etc., in Ug. *ḥḍ* “lucky”, etc. (UG, 534).

b) Arabic *ḥaḍ* does not express “joy, happiness” *at all*, and this meaning is fabricated by Nakhla.

2) Another example chosen at random is *muwazzi’u* expressing in Turkish, according to Nakhla (p. 276), “mail-man” and in Arabic the agent noun of *wazza’a* “to distribute, dispatch”. Due to ignorance of the language, he supposes that CA or MSA *muwazzi’u* has the same meaning as the Arabic loanword in Turkish, i.e. *mail-man*. The word means in all stages of Arabic only “distributer, dispatcher” and never, as it stands, “mail-man” unless you add to it *barīd* “post”, hence *muwazzi’u barīd* lit. “one who distributes the post, i.e. *mail-man*”, *muwazzi’u miyāh* lit. “one who distributes water”, *muwazzi’u badā’i* “one who distributes goods”, *muwazzi’u ’akāḍīb* “one who distributes (spreads) lies”, and so forth. For all other words, see LA.

**2.24.12** CA *handarīsu* “old dates, a kind of old grain or flour, old wine” (LA, r. ḥndrs) is traced by Fränkel (163f & xx) to Greek *khondhros* and *kanthritis*. Fränkel, as we may expect, cites as evidence some Arabic references, Like *Mu’arrab*, in which the word was pronounced loanword. To support Fränkel’s view, I add to his references Ibin Durayd (Jamharah III, p. 1324) and LA; both mentioned that the word *could be borrowed*. To be scientific, however, Fränkel should have also cited some Indo-European cognates to show that the Greek word is *Indo-European and not a loan* from Semitic.

Nakhla (p. 257) follows Fränkel, but, as we *must* expect, fabricates a false meaning for the word to satisfy his instinct and make it look very similar to that of the Greek word: lit. «*a description of wine made from a kind of vineyard called kantarios*». This definition exists nowhere but in his fancy (see LA).

CA *handarīsu* is not an isolated instance in the language with a stem FanḡaLīLu/Fa’LaLīLu formed by adding affixes and/or repeating a radical: cf. *’alṭamīsu* ‘bulky (she-camel), *ḡalfazīzu* “strong and great she-camel”, *dardabīsu* “aged woman” in Al ‘Ayn (VII, 345), but to later scholars and in later dictionaries also denotes “aged man”

(see LA), *ṭalṭamīsu* “very dark, intense darkness” (from [ṭms] “dark(ness)”), *sanṭalīlu* “excessively tall” (from ṭwl “tall”), *ʿanḳafīru* “calamity”, and so forth. The /-n-/ in [ḥndrs] and in nearly all other words with five radicals found in the language is an infix. Moreover, this same /-n-/ is free to occur in any position to facilitate the pronunciation of the word. The most common positions, however, are after the 1<sup>st</sup>, the 2<sup>nd</sup>, or the 3<sup>rd</sup> radical. For example, *ʿanḳafīru* above has /-n-/ after the 1<sup>st</sup> radical, i.e. *in the 1<sup>st</sup> syllable*, but in the verbal form {ʿiʿḳanfara} it shifts to *the 2<sup>nd</sup> syllable* (LA, r. ʿḳfr). Furthermore, the sole reason for the absence of a verb \*iḥdanrasa is that \*-n- can never occur immediately before \*-r in any CA word without an intervening semivowel or long vowel as in *nār* “fire”. Thus the word *nargīsu* “narcissus” is certainly from Greek.

The word [ḥndrs] is Semitic and cognate with Ug. ḥndrθ “a kind of grain for feeding horses” (UG, 533).

**2.24.13** Fränkel (p. 263) derives CA ḥummā “fever” from Syr. ḥemto “temperature”. The word is defined in LA as «*a kind of sickness causing the body to become ‘intensely hot’ and is derived from ḥamīmu “intense heat”*»; also hammu, humma-tu “intense heat”, etc. all from CA ḥamma ~ ḥammā “to heat, make hot, to burn”; ḥammu “heat; hot”, Ug. ḥm id., etc. see §2.2.6 above. The etymology of the CA word shows clearly that it is native. Unfortunately, Fränkel does not tell why he chooses to consider not only this word, but also so many others like *ḥummā* as Syriac loanwords. The natural question rises here: *Should we also consider Tham. ḥmm “suffer from a fever”* (Branden, 1950: 514) *as a loanword from Syriac or from pre-Syriac?*

**2.24.14** Fränkel (p. 110) and Nöldeke (HED, 43) consider that CA baylu, masc., “mule” is borrowed from Eth. baḳl. As we should expect, Fränkel and Nöldeke do not wish to explain why Eth. uvular stop /-ḳ-/ becomes a velar fricative /-ɣ-/ in CA and not /-ḳ-/ *a uvular consonant found– I think– as a distinctive phoneme in the language*<sup>271</sup>. Nor do they feel obliged to cite some other Eth. loanwords (*at least one more word*) in CA in which Eth. /ḳ/ is regularly /ɣ/, as scientific linguistic demands. On the Semitic voiced velar fricative \*ɣ, O’Leary (1969: §14) writes:

«*In Ethiopic Ḃ (ɣ) is confused with Ḃ (ʿ), and both are represented by one letter Ḃ (ʿ), but sometimes Arabic Ḃ (ɣ) appears as ḳ, thus بعل (baylu) = baḳl, “mule”... In Assyrian the ɣ sound merged in ʿ (ʿ), and both became /ʿ/ or /ḥ/ (e.g. CA, Ug., Sab. ṣṣr “small” = Akk.- Assyr. ṣḥr id.)*».

In brief, CA byl “mule” is a pure Arabic word inherited from Proto-Semitic \*byl as in Sab. byl id., Akk. buḥālu “stallion”, etc.

**2.24.15** CA ṯūmu “garlic”; ṯūma-tu “having the shape of garlic”, hence “a tip of sword-handle”, so-called from its shape, which resembles *the garlic*. Both Leslau (HED, 149) and Nakhla (p. 176), following Fränkel<sup>2</sup>, conjecture that the word is taken over from Aram. This word and many others denoting *plant, tree, and vegetables* as well as some

<sup>271</sup> The correspondence CA ɣ = Eth. ḳ occurs only in words borrowed from CA: comp. CA ɣurāb “crow”, Heb., Syr., BAram. ʿrb = Eth. \*ḳurāb as in Amh. ḳura, Gurage ḳurā, kurā id., etc.

basic agricultural terms are pronounced loanwords by Fränkel on the wrong assumption that the native home of CA is a desert. Fränkel also chooses to push the Arab tribes deep into the heart of the desert, away from the Gulf, the Red Sea, and the Indian Ocean, by attributing terms having to do with *the sea* and *sea-activities* to borrowing. As a matter of fact, most of such words occurred in pre-Islamic poetry and the Koran. However, if some of them were pronounced loanwords by old Arab lexicographers on whom he depends, this is because they *-in compiling their dictionaries-* relied heavily, as *is known well by any beginner in the field of Arabic linguistic*, on the language of the desert, which, for good reasons, might not have such words with their expected meanings. For example, a language of the desert is not expected to have a word like *salafa* “to reform land”, *mislafa-tu* = a tool used for this agricultural purpose. Such a predictable fact cannot be used as evidence that the word is a loan unless it is unfound in agricultural communities in old Arabia. Fortunately, it is found, and LA (r. slf) pointed out that the word is most commonly used in Ṭāʾif (area). Similarly, there are so many pure Arabic words in SL denoting trees, plants, birds, reptiles, etc. which look like foreign terms to anyone from Beirut.

1) There is no doubt that Fränkel proceeds from the wrong conception that Arabia in its entirety contains nothing but *sand*, to build his interesting fallacy on borrowing. As a matter of fact, the size of arable land in present-day Saudi Arabia *alone*, not to say old Arabia, is more than fifteen times the size of an agricultural country like Lebanon. Moreover, the historical fact should be stressed here that pre-Islamic Arab tribes were never confined to one geographical area, but found in pre-Islamic times in ancient Syria (e.g. Ghasāsinah) and Mesopotamia (e.g. Manāḍirah) and had their kingdoms and Emirates there. It seems therefore that knowledge of the history of pre-Islamic Arabia and distribution of Arab tribes, together with their old dialects, are a must.

2) In dealing with Christian terms in CA we should never overlook the fact that some Arab tribes in pre-Islamic Arabia were Christians, and that there were famous pre-Islamic Christian poets and men of letters. One of the largest tribes in pre-Islamic Arabia was Taylibu, and there is an interesting early-Islamic saying about this tribe «*lawlā 'al-Islām la'akala banu Taylib 'al 'Arab*», *had not Islam come into existence, the tribe of Taylib would have eaten all the Arabs*, i.e. *all the Arabs would have become Christians because of its considerable size and influence*. Moreover, the most basic Christian terms that are current in Modern Arabic are found in pre-Islamic literature and the Koran.

From all what have been said above, we may conclude that the study of foreign influences upon CA is not a matter of picking up a modern bilingual dictionary and making long lists of similarly sounding words expressing the same sort of meaning with no explanations or any comments whatsoever, *as Nakhla and many others have done*. Nor is it a gathering into a single book all conjectures and surmises made by Arab scholars and Western scholars, *as Fränkel has done*. Classical Arabic is indeed lucky because no facts have been alleged to support a claim that its speakers came into contact with the inhabitants of Siberia and Alaska, for, otherwise, its tens of words which denote “to snow” and *different degrees and types* of “snow” like *hašifu*, *rakfu* (preserved in ʾirtakafa), *ḥalītu*, *saḳīṭu*, *ṭalḡu*, *ṣabību*, *radha-tu* (“snow water”), *sabtu*, and so forth, would have been taken care of within the framework of a similar fallacy. The language

is also so lucky because of the absolute absence of evidence that its speakers came into contact with speakers of Proto-Chinese, with speakers of various Proto-language families throughout the world, esp. in *America and Australia*, etc. for, otherwise, its ‘most basic vocabulary’, even if they are compound words, will be ascribed to borrowing from such proto-languages.

3) In going back to CA *θūmu*, we find that the word is traced to Aramaic *taumā* id., with the result that in this and other words Aramaic /t/ > CA /θ/, but in other supposed loanwords like *tīnu* “fig” (Aram. *tīnā*: Fränkel, p. 148), we find that the same Aramaic /t/ > CA /t/. While Proto-Semitic \*t remains unchanged in Semitic languages, Proto-Semitic \*θ becomes in Akk., BHeb., Phoen. /š/, Aramaic dialects /t/, Ug., CA, OSA. /θ/, Eth. /s/, hence, BHeb. *šūm*, Akk. *šūmu*, CA *θūmu*, Eth. *sōmat*, etc.

Anyone who has just very little knowledge of sound correspondences between Semitic languages (a purely surface knowledge is sufficient here) would certainly know that Semitic \*t is never /š/ in Akk.-BHeb. or /s/ in Eth. And conversely, Semitic \*š is never \*t in Aramaic. Based on this indisputable fact, if we follow the writers and assume that CA *θūmu* is from Aram. *taumā*, we will unquestionably have to consider Aram. *taumā*, on the one hand, and Akk.-BHeb. *šūm*-, Eth. *sōmat*, on the other hand, as non-cognates.

Similar cases involve words containing at least one of these consonants /ħ, ḥ, ʕ, ʿ, δ, ḍ, ḏ/, where we find the same Aramaic consonant, for example /ḥ/, appears for no reason we may think of as /ḥ/ or /h/ in CA words conjectured to be borrowed from Aramaic, as in Aramaic *bḥ*, CA *bḥ* “water melon” (Fränkel, p. 140) and Aramaic *plḥ*, CA *flḥ* “plow” (Fränkel, p. 126). It should be noted that Proto-Semitic \*ḥ is in CA, Ug., Akk., OSA /h/, but in Aram., BHeb., Phoen., etc. /ḥ/, and that Proto-Semitic \*ḥ is in CA, Aram., BHeb., Phoen., Ug., etc. /ḥ/. Besides, Proto-Semitic \*p is regularly CA /f/, but in Aramaic, BHeb., Phoen. and Akk. is /p/. To prove that any of such CA words is borrowed from Aramaic, one has to explain in an explicit and unambiguous way the conditions under which the sound change occurs in the supposed Arabic loanword. This is, of course, what scientific linguistics demands.

4) Fränkel’s theory, as outlined above, is a failure. Besides all what have been said about it, there is still one important fact concerning CA I would like to shed some light upon. Fränkel’s attempt to show that words belonging to some segments of the CA dictionary have been adopted from foreign languages reveals, as an unquestionable and absolute fact, an obvious ignorance of the language. Nearly all, if not indeed all, of the words he deals with express special meanings.

What does the term ‘special meaning’ mean and what are its implications? It means that for any word denoting an object or a thing Fränkel ascribes to borrowing on the wrong assumption that the thing/object is foreign to the Arabs (trees, plants, agricultural terms, and so forth). There exist several or tens of other different words denoting various aspects, types, or stages of the thing/object itself. The implications are that if you go along with Fränkel and suppose that CA *biṭṭihu* (see above), for instance, is from Syr. *baṭṭikā* or *paṭṭihē*, you will find that *biṭṭihu* is a special term in CA denoting only the final stage of ‘water melon’. The first stage is *ḡa’saru*, then *ḥaḍfu*, next *ḡuḥḥu*, next *ḥadaḡu*, esp. in *Old Najd*, but *ḡuḥḥu* in other dialects..., finally *biṭṭihu*. Thus, any of such words proves that ‘water-melon’ is not foreign to the Arabs.

Moreover, if we want to break ‘a water-melon’ then, out of very numerous words (hundreds) for “to break” with each expressing a very special meaning<sup>272</sup>, the special verb to be used is *faḍaḥa* (shift the order of /bṭh/ and restore to it its earlier \*ḍ). If one, however, wants to cut a water-melon into slices, he is bound to use *ḥaḍ’ala*, and so on. In the light of this fact, saying that *biṭṭiḥu* is foreign to the Arabs is indeed a matter worthy of earsplitting laughter. The same holds true for nearly all other words cited by Fränkel and by other self-assumed experts of loanwords in CA.

**2.24.16** Fränkel (p. 55), following Nöldeke, traced CA *ziyyu* to Persian *zêb*, apparently because both begin with /z-/, and this is one of their important *scientific criteria*.

CA *ziy* is a derivative of *zay* whose deepest signification is “shine”. However, the meaning under study is “falsify > feign, fake, i.e. *model oneself after the behavior or appearance of another, make it like*: as in *ta-zayyā bi ziyyi fulān* (*fulān* = somebody, so if *fulān* is strong, handsome, wearing attractive clothes, eloquent, and so forth, *he would try to be like him in every respect*, hence *ta-zayyā* also expresses “to spruce up, embellish oneself, smarten up” (Al ‘Ayn VII, 396) = Targ. *zīwā* “brightness”, in Syr. “beauty, splendor”, Akk. *zīm* “brightness, radiance” (DRS VIII, 725). Some others related kindreds are:

a) Akk. *zīpu*, CA *zaiyafa* [zyf], Mand. *zipa* “falsify” (MD, 167), “to falsify, *zayafa* “to walk in a boastful manner, to counterfeit (money)”.

b) Akk. *zānu* “décorer, embellir”, Ge. *zena* “décorer”, Amh. *täzäyyänä* “être beau, brave”, Meh. *azyin*, Jib. *ezyin* “embellir, parer”, Soq. *əzyən* “belle (femme)” (DRS VIII, 726), CA *zaiyana* “to adorn, illumine; ornament, embellishment”;

c) Akk. *zīḫ-*, *zīḫt-* “torch”, BHeb. *zīḫōt* “burning arrows, fiery darts” (OT, 276; DRS VIII, 728), CA [zyḫ], said of a woman, “to beautify oneself, embellish, adorn”; *zīḫu* also expresses in some old dialects “ray (of the sun)”, i.e. lit. *saliva* (of the sun)” just like *rīḫu* of a human being; CA [zyḡ] = [zyḫ] in meaning, [zyk] as in *zāka* “to walk in a boastful manner”. Also, gen. Sem. zhr, zyt, etc.

**2.24.17** Leslau (HED, 108), following Nöldeke, who plots, as usual, for CA *minbaru* a signification ‘platform’, apparently to facilitate its establishment as a loanword from the Ethiopic root [nbr] “to sit”. Since we don’t know why the word is pronounced *non-native* and the reason for prescribing to it *that meaning*, Nöldeke and Leslau, as a guess,

<sup>272</sup> Like «*šaḡḡa* (the head), *haṣama* (the nose), *hatama* (a tooth), *ḡaṣama* (the back), *ḡarada* (the bread), *ṣadaḥa* (head of a snake), *raḍḍa* (the grain, in SL only ‘the bone’), *hadda* (a pillar), *faḡaṣa* (an egg, in SL with -ṣ for -š), *ratama* (a stone), *fadaṣa* (an onion, SL *fadaṣ* ‘to break the head with a stone’), and so forth» (adopted from Tha’ālibi, FL, p. 215).

It may be important to note that some of such terms are ‘cover terms’ for many more words expressing ‘restricted special meanings’. For example, *šaḡḡa* above, which applies only to the head area, i.e. *head and face*, is no more than a cover term for many kinds of ‘break’ ranging from the lowest or slightest degree to the deadly one like *ḡāriṣa-tu* (vb *ḡaraṣa*) = a slight ‘break’, i.e. *one with no blood*, next *bāḍi’a-tu* (vb *baḍa’ā*) = penetrating into the flesh, next *simḡāḡ* = reaching the area between *flesh and bone*, and so forth (Zajāji’s Amāli, p. 23-24).

suppose that a speaker on a platform should *sit on a chair*, and that, because CA [nbr] does not express “to sit”, nor does it offer a derivative for ‘*seat*’ or ‘*chair*’ to the speaker, as *courtesy, politeness, and etiquette*, may demand, the word has to be a loan from a language, no matter any language, that has this verb. Only on this whim, *I suppose*, the Ethiopic word has been carefully chosen.

Fortunately, it happens that CA never allows a verb like ‘*to sit*’ to be used with the word *minbaru* in any context *at all*. The only verbs allowed are “to ascend”, “rise”, “climb”, etc. like *ša’ida, ṭala’a, irtaḳā*, etc., and the reason for this will be explained below. It thus appears from the onset that CA *minbaru* has nothing to do with Eth. [nbr] and notion “to sit”. Also, and above all, the CA word has also *nothing do with the meaning* conferred on it by Leslau and his misleading reference, Nöldeke.

CA *nabara* means *only* “to raise the voice to a high pitch, to accentuate”, derived from *nabara* “to raise, elevate, ascend” and from this notion the word in question has been derived by prefixing the instr. /mi-/ (ṢHH II, 821; LA). Thus our poor *minbaru*, the word under study, means only in the language of the Arabs “a ladder, stair (leading to a place considered higher than the level of the floor)”. The Prophet’s platform, for example, consisted of *three steps* only, while that of Caliph Hārūn Rashid of *nine* (Nawawi, *Taḥṭīb Al Asmā’ wa Al Luṡāt* II, 586). The word {mi + nbaru}, as we have just mentioned, is the instr. form of [nbr] “to ascend, raise, elevate”, and it may be wise to cite some additional examples illustrating prefixed mi-:

mirḳā-tu “stair” < raḳā “to ascend step by step”,  
 minaṣṣs-tu “platform” < naṣṣa, and so forth.  
 minwalu < nawala,  
 minsāḡu < nasaḡa,

One of the most common CA words for “platform” is *mi-naṣṣa-tu* above, from *naṣṣa* “to raise, elevate”), with this word one may use the verb “to sit” as in *ḡalasa ‘alā (‘a)l minaṣṣati*. It is indeed unfortunate that the writers had made the wrong choice; *they should have chosen [nṣṣ], since it shares in common with the Ethiopic root the initial radical /n-/ and, above all, it can occur with the verb “to sit”*.

In all Arabic dialects the signification of *minbaru* has been extended to “platform”. MSA *minbaru* expresses both, the earlier and the recent meanings. In this case, as in all other cases, a study of the etymology of the Arabic word and knowledge of its morphological structure are never considered a scientific requirement by the writers. Our study of this etymology, as well as the etymologies of all other CA words, clearly testifies to the absolute fact that all modern writers on CA loanwords have decidedly chosen the very wrong subject to throw conjectures at.

**2.24.18** Leslau (HED, 112), following Nöldeke, considers CA «*miskīn* “poor”, (is) of Aramaic origin (Nöldeke, NBsS 45)». A similar claim is made by Drower and Macuch (MD, 268), who, following P. Jenses and H. Zimmern, treat Aram., Heb., CA, Eth. *mskn* as a loan from Akk. *muškēnu* pt. of *šukennu*. Before deciding on whether CA *miskīnu* is non-native, we should, as scientific linguistic and objectivity require, study its etymology, a subject has never paid any attention to by Semitists.

LA [r. skn] states that: «*miskīnu* is miF’iLu (formed) from *sukūnu*, like *minṭīḳu* from

*nuṭṭu*», etc., and that CI *sakana*, CIV *'askana*, CVIII *'istakana* besides *tamaskana* (?) and *'istakāna* (?) “be submissive, humble; inferior”. LA also adds *sakana*, *'askana*, *tamaskana* “become submissive, be acquiescent, humble” > “weak, inferior” > (perh., *though not to my knowledge*) “poor”, also, esp. *'askana* “to confine, restrict movement” = Assy. *šakānu* “to place something on someone, to execute (punishment)” (King, 1898: 389), Ug. *škn* “to impose” (UG, 533). It is very important to note that LA derives the verb *tamaskana* above from the noun *miskīnu* on the analogy of *tamadra'a* from *midra'a-tu* [r. dr'], where the speakers wrongly thought in both cases that the prefix /mi-/ is part of the root, and that the derived verb *'istakāna* above is actually CX of *kāna* “to be” also “be submissive” rather than of *sakana* “to dwell, be submissive, i.e. *exhibiting no activity*, inferior; humiliated”. On the other hand, CX verb of *sakana* is *'istaskana*: {stem *'istaFḡaLa*: see §2.4}, whose meaning is identical with that of *'istakanna* “to dwell” also “be submissive” (= *'iktinātu* [r. kwn “be”] “submission”): CA *kinnu* “dwelling place, home” → CA *maskanu*, Akk. *maškanu*, BHeb. *miškān*, etc. gen. Sem. id. For further information on Akk. and CA [škn], see §§2.2.13; 2.2.57.1; 2.10.3, etc. above

The CA word, as evidence shows, is a natural development of “being acquiescent, submissive, humiliated, inferior”. The meaning of the word, to be sure, is *not precisely* “poor”, though in some contexts it may semantically approaches the idea “poor”. Even in such contexts, old scholars’ views widely differ (LA *ibid.*, Ibin Duraïd’s *Jamharah* I, 855f). The following definition of the word clarifies its basic meaning and distinguishes it from the word *faḳīru* “poor”, the root meaning of *miskīnu* in the language is ‘submissive’ and that of *faḳīru* is ‘poor, needy’ (LA *ibid.*). Hence, the Prophet said:

«*'allāhumma 'aḥyinī miskīnan wa 'amitnī miskīnan...*», O God!  
make me live *miskīn* and die *miskīn*.

In SL, the word *miskīn* (also pronounced *maskēn*), said of a person, may express *unassuming, un-harming, easy to get along with*, and the like, but never ‘poor’ in the sense of ‘needy’. As a matter of fact, the person described as *miskīnu* may be the *wealthiest* man on earth. The same holds true for CA. LA (see r. fḳr) states that:

«*in such examples as in ḍuriba fulānun 'al miskīnu or ḍulima 'al miskīnu* “Somebody (who is) *maskīn* was beaten or was oppressed”, ‘*miskīnu*’ has nothing to do with ‘poverty’, since the person described as *miskīnu* may be wealthy and rich».

a) It is true that CA /mi-/ indicates ‘the instrumental’ as in *miṭāḥu* “key”, the instrument or means used to carry out the meaning of the verb *fataḥa* “to open”. There are some cases, however, in which /mi-/ may have nothing to do with the instrumental idea as in *mihḍāru* “prater” from *haḍara* “to prate”, *mintinu* (with a variant *muntinu*) “one who emits a foul odor, stinking”: *natina* “to stink”, *mimḍalu* “one who is anxious or disturbed”: *maḍala* “be anxious”, etc. The same holds true for *mi-* in *miskīnu*. In such forms the prefix *mi-* is either a variant of the agentive prefix *mu-* “one who is/does” as in *mu'allimu* “one who teaches, i.e. teacher” from *'allama* “to teach”, or (much more likely) an objective affix (?) expressing “one who is the object of submission”.

b) Both Akk. and CA, like all other Semitic languages, adopted the Semitic causative prefix \*š as part of the root (cf. §2.2.13 above). The word thus consists of bound

morphemes [\*m and \*-š-] + a stem \*ka-n.

**2.24.19** Drower and Macuch (MD, 391), also following Nöldeke, bestow upon CA *ṣīṣiyya-tu* a signification “plait of hair” and trace it, together with Heb. and Aram. *ṣyṣy*, to Akk. *ṣīṣī-tu* “plait of hair”. The CA word has nothing to do with that signification conferred upon by the writers and their *misleading reference*. It signifies “needle used in knitting”; *ṣiyāṣī* pl. (of \*ṣī) “horn”, etc. Accordingly, the situation here is similar to that of *minbaru* and *miskīnu* above.

**2.24.20** Following Nöldeke, Fränkel (137, 250), together with Drower and Macuch (MD, 437), traced CA *rašama* and *rasama* to Aramaic *ršm* without any justification or explanation. *Is it because of the interchange of /š/ and /s/?* If this is the real reason, one may wonder- *with some justified irony*- why they confined their ‘scientific criterion’ to this pair of words, and did not include, *in addition to so many similar minimal pairs of words cited so far in this research*, very numerous others like *ka’asa ~ ka’aša* “to twist”, *akbaša ~ akabasa* “to fetter”, *ša’wu ~ sa’wu* “dung (of a she-camel), *šanna ~ sanna* “to pour”, *infis ~ infiš* “short and mean”, *faslu ~ fašlu* “bad, of low quality”, *nahaša ~ nahasa*, and so forth. *Is it because they didn’t find the words above in Aram. or they are selective?*

**2.24.21** Following the very same misleading reference, Leslau (HED, 71) treats CA *ḡilbābu* “a large outer cover” as a loan from Ge. *gʷālbābā* “cover, veil”: Te. *gābāba* “cover, wrap up”, Amh. *gʷāllābā* “cover the drum with hide”, Cush.: Ga. *gōlāba* id., etc. The CA word signifies “an outer garment covering the head and chest (and is larger than *himār*, one of many other words signifying a similar meaning)”; *ḡilbu* “a cover (often of saddle)”; *ḡulba-tu*, *ḡulbā-nu* “piece of hide covers the saddle”. All are from *ḡubba-tu fem.* “outer robe or cover”, where the 1<sup>st</sup> /-b-/ of *ḡubba-* dissimilates to /-l-/; this is a common phonological process in HS and it is most prevalent and widespread in CA (§3.17. 80 above).

Some other trilaterals having the very same three radicals [ḡlb] that have been brought into existence as a result of *dissim.* of /-b-/ of [gbb] to /-l-/ are:

- 1) *ḡulba-tu* pl. “heaps of stones” is from \**ḡubba-tu*, *ḡabūb* pl. “stones and coarse land”,
- 2) *ḡalaba-tu* “tumult, noise” (also present in Eth. and Cush.: see §2.11.58, n. 1a, 1b above) < *ḡubāḡibu* (by redupl.) “one who makes a lot of *ḡalaba-tu*”,
- 3) *ḡulba-tu* “severe hunger” < *gabābu* “severe drought, dearth”
- 4) *ḡulbā-nu* “sheath, scabbard” < *ḡubba-tu* “shield”, etc.

**2.24.21** In dealing with foreign influences upon CA, It may be equally ‘funny’ and ‘amusing’ to take a glance at Addi Shir’s work (1990, mentioned above), who, like Nöldeke, Fränkel, Nakhla, and all others, seems to be inspired with *ardent infatuation* and *blind love* for writing ‘scientific research’ on a subject he is in the dark about. The following examples will give a clear idea of his work.



**2.24.22** Addi Shir (p. 99) asserts that CA *šariba* “to drink” is from a Persian compound word سیر آب. Evidence shows that the word is Semitic: cf. Ug. *šrb* “to drink” (UG, 542), Eth. *šrb* id., etc.

**2.24.23** CA *ṭayru* “gate, door, opening of the mouth, river-mouth”, *metaph.* “mouth”, esp. in Poet. Addi Shir (p. 37) traces the word to Persian *zafar* زفر, apparently because they have the consonant /t/ in common. The word is again Semitic: cf. Ug. *ṭyr*, Amarna *ša-aḥ-ri*, BHeb. *šʿr* “door, gate”, etc. (Shehadeh, 1968: 151).

**2.24.24** CA *mahru* “bride-price, paid (all or part of it) for the bride to her parent”. Gesenius’ definition of the term as “dowry, promised by a bridegroom to his future wife” is correct, but it applies to modern *mahru* only in a country like Lebanon; BHeb. *mhr* “price, paid for a bride to her parents” (OT, 543), Ug. *mhr* “bride-price” (UG, 535), etc. The word, however, is confirmed by Addi Shir (p. 147) to be from Persian *mīhr* “love and friendly relation”.

**2.24.25** CA *bāriḡa-tu* is, according to Addi Shir (p. 18), from either Persian *bārg-* “king’s court” (?) or from Grk *βᾱρῖς*, εως, ἰδος (?). To Nakhla, as we have seen above, the word is indirectly borrowed from Latin. For the definite origin of this native compound-word, see §2.24.29, n. 2 below.

**2.24.26** Addi Shir (p. 159) derives CA *waynu* “black grapes” from Persian *wīyn* “wine”. CA word is again Semitic: cf. Ug. *yn* “wine” (UG, 537), Sab. *wyn* “vineyard” (SD, 166), EHeb. *yyn*, OffAram. *yyn* “wine” (NWSI I, 455), etc.

**2.24.27** CA *māʿida-tu* is traced by Fränkel (p. 83) to Ge. *mâed*, and by Addi Shir (p. 148) to Persian. A deep analysis has already been given to this pure Arabic word in §2.10.20 above.

**2.24.28** The foregoing discussion shows clearly that the study of foreign influences upon CA has been a fertile field of many *unscientific books and childish trivials*, which present to the reader long lists of words, often with *no comments or explanations*, written by persons who are, as we have witnessed, *foolishly uninformed about the language and its linguistic history*. There is no doubt that CA dictionary contains around four hundred loanwords from foreign languages, esp. *from Persian, Greek, and Aramaic*. The capital error in Fränkel’s work lies in both it follows blindly all surmises made by old Arab scholars, and it lacks any scientific criterion for determining whether a word is native or not. Besides, the work, like all others, overlooks the etymology of the CA word. For these reasons, we find that the work hits the truth *only by chance* in very few cases and misses it *in all others*. Because it is unscientific to accept a book having such characteristics, Fränkel’s work is wholly rejected.

2) There is still, however, what I may call, ‘*an evil feature*’, common to some books on loanwords *only in CA* which is, to my knowledge, never found in any research on a similar topic. This *evil* shows itself in the making up of hundreds of foreign words do

not exist in the language *at all* and claiming that such words are loans in the language.

Nakhla (p. 256), who, as we have seen above, is fond of twisting facts and fabricating falsehoods, goes this time beyond all limits to import words from foreign languages, write them in Arabic script, and claim that they are Arabic loanwords, e.g. *banṭafilun* is from Greek πσντάφυλλον, etc. Such words, which *I have never heard of or read*, like so many others in his preposterous book, do not exist in the language, though they certainly give some idea of his aim and make his purpose of fabricating lies clear to the reader.

3) Before closing this section, I still have a few words to say about old Arab scholars' approach to borrowing. In addition to all what I have been mentioned above concerning their aim and subjective method, I would like to bring to light an important fact, which was evidently a factor that motivated some of them to ascribe so many native CA words to borrowing. This fact is reflected in their tacit desire to show off their knowledge of foreign languages, *a subject they were as ignorant of as modern writers on Arabic loanwords are ignorant of Arabic itself*. Siyyūṭi (Muzhir I, pp.122-123) assumes that «*there are everyday (CA) words that are of foreign origins*». By following the first criterion 'transmission' for determining loanwords in the language as discussed above, he cites Tha'ālibi's long list of words, entitled: «*Nouns still in use in Arabic but have long been forgotten in Persian*».

The list includes the most basic and indispensable HS terms like *kaffu* "(palm of the) hand" (HS kpp id.), *sāḳu* [r. swḳ] "thigh" (HS šwḳ id.), and so forth. To expand his list, he also included derivatives of roots that can never be found as native words in any language on earth except CA and its closest sister languages like, for example, *kitābu* "book" from *kataba* "to write". Fortunately, his list (*not me*) soon testifies to his *expected ignorance of Persian*, since it comprises some common Persian nouns (which- by negating his words- *has never been forgotten*) like *ḡallābu* from Persian *golāb*, a compound of *gol* "rose" and *āb* "water". Ironically, Siyyūṭi himself, as mentioned above, wrote a book on borrowing in CA. It is with this mental darkness old Arab scholars and their modern disciples have approached loanwords in the language.

**2.24.29** Painful though it is to have to admit it, modern writers' shots in the dark are not without *some merit*. They have *the merit, questionable though it is*, of bringing to my attention some words to point out their origins like *miskīnu*, *minbaru*, etc. above. The following is a study aimed at uncovering the origins of Eth. *nbr* "to sit" and CA *bāriḡa-tu* "warship".

1) Eth. [nbr] "to sit" as a n. "seat, tribunal" is ultimately cognate with CA nabūru = إست 'ist, i.e. "buttocks, anus", on which one sits (see §2.9.18 above); nabru "place where food (i.e. *crops*) is stored, store"; 'anbāru is a plural term having no sg. form (like 'abwā'u and 'ablā'u in the language) and used as "name of a town, of place", perh. orig. *houses that constitute a town*".

The Eth. root also denotes "to exist" and "to heap up" as in Har. nābārā "to exist"; anbābārā "put one on top of another, heap up", Amh. annābabbārā "to pile up" (HED, 117): cf. CA barā "to create (God)", i.e. bring into existence; CIV 'abarra "rank first, rise over all others". For what concerns the notion "heap up, put things on top of one another, pile up" = CA CVIII 'intabara [nbr] id.

2) CA *bāriġa-tu* fem. “ship, warship”, so much troubled the writers, is a compound of \**bar* “ship” as in Ug. *br* id. (UG, 535), Egyp. *b’rí* id. (EHD I, 204), and \*’*ġ-* as in CA *’aġġa* “to attack an enemy”. It may be important to note that CA has a lot of words for different kinds of “ship” and there is, to my knowledge, no language on earth has words denoting ‘*sea*’, its various conditions, ‘*wave*’, etc. more than CA.

## *2.25 CONCLUDING REMARKS ON PHS ROOTS*

1) The concept that a HS root consists of a number of radical consonants expressing the basic meaning of the word, as explained in §§2.1-2.1.3 & 2.1.7-2.1.7.3, and ranging from one to five, termed as *unilateral*, *biliteral*, *trilateral*, *quadrilateral*, and *quinqueliteral*, must be utterly abandoned, simply because PHS had never had such roots, and that our deep study of the roots in all daughter languages does not reveal evidence to support, or even to hint at, the earlier presence of such roots.

2) PHS only had a very limited stock of monosyllabic proots with each syllable stood for a general or abstract meaning, and consisting of  $C^1v(C^2)$ , where  $C^1$  = *any consonant*,  $v$  = *a vowel, short or long /i, a, u/,* and  $C^2$  = *any consonant, the weak and the strong*. While  $C^1$  and  $v$  are obligatory,  $C^2$  is optional, i.e. *some syllables may or may not have it*.

2a) We have already seen in §2.13.7 above that [b'g] “helpless, feeble, inactive, empty of strength, tired, wretched, needy”, traditionally classified as ‘*trilateral*’, is *-as evidence shows-* a compound of a number of proots, the obvious of which are \*ba’ and [ga’ or gaw]. It is obvious from the reconstruction that the compound has lost a number of syllables in the course of development. The same compound can be expanded by entering into combinations with other proots. For example, we can expand the compound by combining it with proot [’a’] as in Egyp. ’b’g “be weak, helpless” (EHD I, 111). Among related compounds are Egyp. yb’gí “weak, helpless” (EHD I, 39) and ’g “to lack, to want” (EHD I, 11).

2b) It is this root syllable that Semitic scripts often represent with a radical consonant. However, this does not always imply that two radicals represent a disyllabic root, and three radicals a trisyllable, and so on, since syllables and sounds within compounds are susceptible to loss or modification for either *ease of pronunciation* or *phonotactics* as we have already seen throughout this research.

2c) Two or more syllables may combine together to express a very special meaning. All HS syllables have come down to us in combinations. Traditional work wrongly classifies such combinations of syllables on the basis of both the number of their radical consonants and their types into *unilateral*, *biliteral*, *trilateral*, etc., and into *weak*, *doubled*, *sound*, etc.

2d) In our attempt to make a distinction between a ‘*surface structure*’ and ‘*deep structure*’ of a HS root, we have already hinted at *a fact of far reaching effects* on the ‘*linguistic theory*’ associate with ‘*deep structure*’ and on our view of language change and development in the course of time: *the surface structure of a root may have a number of ‘deep structures’ lying beneath it* (see §2.1.8, esp. n. c above). Each ‘*deep structure*’ is orig. *an older surface structure* that can only be studied scientifically by reference to ‘*the evolutionary stage*’ at which it was formed.

An illustrative example may be Sem. surface trilateral [rmš] “evening” (§2.15.2 above), which is from an older surface structure [mš-] “evening, night” as in Akk. mūšu, Egyp. mšw, CA masā’. This is in turn a compound composed of two proots: *mu* “time (of) and *suy* (in compounds *mu-syu*) “evening” (§2.10.13 above).

Anoter example is HS [’hb] “love” as in Ug. ’hb “to love”, Egyp. yhb “to rejoice”, etc. see §2.3.49 above, which is from an older surface structure [hb ~ ħb] plus the prefixed caus. /’-/. The biradical [hb ~ ħb] is another surface form arising from an older

compound, consisting of two proots \*ha' ~ ħa' "joy, rejoice" in Egyp. h' ~ ħ' "rejoice" and (-Wb) in Egyp. yb, b "heart". CA has preserved the notion of 'rejoice' in ħubūr = Egyp. ħb id.

3) Inflectional and derivational affixes of all parts of speech, including the verb and its personal affixes, which are abounded in inflectional language families like HS and IE, have been the product of evolution. *Every affix is originally an independent syllable having a definite meaning and its subsequent evolutionary history resembles that of syllables we have already dealt with like [da-] (§2.1.6.5.1), [ba-] (§2.13), [ʿa-] (§2.14), etc.*

4) The basic source of the verb is *the noun*; other sources can be the adjective and the preposition. However, the prevalent hypothesis among scholars is that the verb antecedes the noun. Like nearly everything else, the hypothesis has been advanced by Indo-Europeanists and their HS disciples in spite of clear evidence to the contrary. Against this hypothesis, old Arab scholars, starting with *Farāhīdī*, assert that the noun is the source (= *maṣḍar*) of the verb as well as of all other parts of speech. *Four* simple, suggestive, and easily comprehended arguments in affinity with *law of nature* and *law of evolution* will be briefly put forth below in favor of 'noun' as *maṣḍar* of all parts of speech.

4a) A verb like 'eat' calls for the previous existence of a term 'food', and without the term the verb becomes empty of content, exactly as 'drink' and 'bind' call for the previous existence of 'water' and 'rope or string' respectively. This implies that 'food', 'water', and 'rope' are immensely older than their respective verbs. This fact can be generalized to all *primitive verbs*.

4b) Structurally speaking, *the noun, and not its verb*, is the part of speech that can often serve as a reliable guide to the underlying structure of the word. Putting it in different words, the morphological structure of a noun, esp. *its pl. form in many cases, reveals the number of proots glued together to form a word*. An example from CA unmentioned above is [ġwħ]: CI ġāħa, rarely used, "to eradicate, annihilate, destroy", i.e. lit. *exterminate by means of ġā'iħa-tu*. The most commonly used stem is CVIII 'iġtāħa id.; ġā'iħu pl. "locusts", so-called from the damage or disaster they cause; ġawħu "annihilation, death": ġā'iħa-tu fem. "(great) disaster, calamity" *that wipes out everything (vegetation, cattle, etc.) and does not leave for one 'wiġāġ' (= anything or a meager thing remains after a disaster)*. *Is the word ġā'iħ-, and consequently its traditional root, a simple word- created by nature, by God, by supernatural force, or a compound created by man in a very systematic and methodical way?* The word is a compound noun consisting of [ga' or gā] (see §2.17.83 above) and ['iħ] "disaster", seen in Egyp. ['ħ] id.; mg'ħw "afflicted" (EHD I, 8, 331)<sup>273</sup>, whose initial m- forms the pp. of g'ħ "be weary". For its cognates, see §3.4.53 below.

Verb stem *ġāħa*, like any other stems *bāħa*, *nāħa*, *rāħa*, *fāħa*, *nāba*, *kāda*, *nāda*, *bāda*,

<sup>273</sup> As has been mentioned on many occasions above 'compound' appeared in language long before 'derivation', which in turn began to be used long before 'inflection'.

sāka, ḏāka, lāka, ʾāka, and so on, is incapable of revealing any significant information about its underlying structure. The reason for this fact is not too far to seek; *it is a derivative*.

4c) In nearly all cases, it is impossible to express a simple or CI verb without adding extra-phonemes to the noun stem or *maṣdar* from which it is derived as in *katbu* “writing” > *kataba* “write”; *ʾaklu* “food” > *ʾakala* “eat”, *ḡatlu* “killing” > *ḡatala* “kill”, and so on. In this case, *the shorter is the older*.

In a few cases, however, the reverse is true as in *suʾālu* “a question”: *saʾala* “to ask”, where the verb stem is shorter than its corresponding noun, which includes *a long vowel*. *Should we consider this example an exception or evidence supporting my view in (b) above?* For the correct answer, see §2.2.46 above.

4d) I have already drawn attention on a number of occasions to the fact that one of the methods of forming a verb is to add an affix to a noun as in Egyp. *bʾk* “to work, labor, toil, do service”: *ba-ʾk* (for this example, see §2.4.11 above).

5) There is no hard evidence compelling me to consider *velarized consonants* /ṭ, ḏ, ṣ/ and some voiced consonants such as /ḏ/ and /z/ as distinctive phonemes in *early PHS*<sup>274</sup>. Such consonants are due to *sound change*, esp. *phonemic split, assimilation, and phonotactics*.

The use of ‘voice’ as a sort of *word formation* as in English *use* (n.)-*use* (v.) and *breath-breathe* is not easily recognizable in HS languages simply because of the interchange of consonants with the same point of articulation.

One of the most obvious examples illustrating that ‘voice’ may be used to express a grammatical function is CA *rakala* “to kick with the foot”: *riglu* “foot” (OAram. lgr, rgl id., OffAram., BAram., Syr., Palm., BHeb. rgl id., Sab. rgl, Eth. egr id.): comp. SL, Leb., etc. *ṣarkal* “make s.o. stumble or fall to ground by putting one’s leg in his way as he walks or run” (see §2.4.22, n. b above).

We also find in CA very few cases where consonants with similar point of articulation may express a grammatical function as *kaffu* “palm of the hand” (gen. HS [kap] id.) > *ḡaffāfu* “one who steals (e.g. money) with *the palm of the hand*” as a vb *ḡaffa* (see §2.17.54 above). See n. 10 below, esp. section ‘*Further remarks on HS and Chinese Grammars*’.

6) Besides its original signification, the proot has accrued a large number of related meanings, esp. in inflectional languages, in the course of time, and it is our primary task to determine the oldest signification of each proot. Once the oldest signification is determined, *one can see how it changes and develops regularly in the course of time, and can fully realize*, after a careful and scientific comparative studies of world’s languages, that *all language families share in common the same proots and, originally, the same methods of word-formation*.

To see how the ‘*meaning of a proot*’ extends its scope in the course of time, I will use PHS [gan], an already studied root (see §§2.1.6.5.4 & 2.1.6.5.5 above) as an illustrative

---

<sup>274</sup> But see §2.3.10, n. c above before making a decision.

example *in order to bring to light a fact of great magnitude and of deep and lasting effect on the study of language in general and comparative linguistics and etymology in particular.*

We have already seen that PHS [gan] “a cover; to cover, etc.” is based on [ga] “roof; house” (§2.1.6.5.4 above) and that this signification had developed from “protected place, place of concealment” (§2.1.6.5.5 above). It will be shown below that all such meanings are later developments. At the same time, I will bring to the forefront *the method to be used* in studying the etymology of a word or root; *a method* which will plainly show that all world’s languages are related since when we apply it, we will arrive at the proot and its primeval meaning and discover that it is still alive in all world’s languages<sup>275</sup>.

One may argue that PHS gan- is from \*gW- “roof, house” plus /-n/. The unquestionable fact is that notion like ‘house or roof’ is a later development in man’s history on this earth, and that it is ultimately from *a place* or *a natural cave, shelter, hiding place, hole*. The capital error in all what has been written on this subject and on all other similar subjects is that one simple fact related to man, to his environment, and to the sort of life he lived and led before the first or second millennium of the Neolithic age has been completely overlooked. That words and roots attributed to that period must truly reflect its culture, i.e. *a purely stone-age culture*.

Man lived in natural caves and caverns and his tools and weapons were of *stone, wood, and bone*. Such tools must have been of the simplest kind, rarely modified by his hands, and used for diverse purposes: *cutting, scraping, hunting, fighting, and self-defense*. He ate fruit, all kinds of animals, even those creeping or dragging themselves along the ground. He hunted animals either with stone weapons or by trapping them, and caught fish with his hands, if he lived nearby a sea or river.

In the course of the Mesolithic age, but before the advent of the Neolithic age, man, esp. *in the Middle East and Egypt*, began to learn how to domesticate and breed animals, how to use animal milk.

Written documents suggest that the earliest stages of human civilization concurrent with the invention of writing began to emerge in the second half of the 4<sup>th</sup> millennium B.C., and the stone age culture began gradually to give way to a metal culture in the three river valleys: *the Nile, Tigris, and Euphrates*, i.e. *in Egypt and Mesopotamia* (Iraq), later spreading in varying degrees of speed to different parts of the world. The date given to the invention of writing by the Sumerians and Egyptians actually represents a refined stage of representing objects and ideas by symbols. Accordingly, the stage is a natural outcome of many earlier stages in which man was attempting to write.

The idea gathered from the three foregoing paragraphs may leave the wrong belief that one should not reconstruct roots expressing notions like ‘house’, ‘roof’, ‘door’, etc. on the account that such notions didn’t exist at the time of Proto-Hamito-Semitic. This is, of course, not the purpose of the idea and Hamito-Semitic language divisions, as we will see, share in common numerous terms for each of the just cited notions, which prove that they existed in PHS. The real purpose is of fourfold:

---

<sup>275</sup> We have already seen this method in theory and application in §§2.1.6.5.1, n. 1 above and 2.16, n. 7 above.

- a) *To investigate and establish the concepts underlying such derived notions.*
- b) *To establish a solid ground for a true conception of what language is and how it evolves in the course of time.*
- c) *To deduce a definite law for the development of language in general and Hamito-Semitic in particular that would lead to a real insight into language change and widen the horizon of comparative linguistics.*
- d) *To provide a scientific method of studying the ultimate origin of every linguistic form, and show how that that ‘origin’ has developed in the course of time into tens of roots in language (n. 3 below).*

2) In going back in time through the history of man on earth, we will certainly reach stages at which words for notions like ‘house’, ‘roof’, ‘fire’, etc. were nonexistent, animals like ‘dog’, ‘cat’, ‘horse’, or ‘cow’ were not yet domesticated. We will also find that ‘man’ spoke to his fellow tribesmen, but didn’t know how to write, and that he didn’t have access to ‘fire’, so that he didn’t *cook, roast, bake, burn*, etc. The later emergence of such terms at subsequent historical stages results from cultural developments, which required new vocabulary to name previously nonexistent objects, things, and ideas. The name given to a previously unknown object could be either coined according to the particular methods of word formation available in the language or expressed by an existing word which acquires a new meaning<sup>276</sup>.

3) Every word in a language has its own etymological history, and its presence in the language will sooner or later call for the presence of other words as the term ‘*sun*’ created— in the remote past and over stages— a need for terms denoting ‘*hot, heat, light, to rise, shine, to set, to burn, fire, etc.*’, ‘*water*’ “*wet, to drink, to pour, be wet, moist, to drown, etc.*”, ‘*night*’ “*dark, darkness, to be or become dark, to cover, etc.*”, and so on.

We have thus far prepared the ground for a point of far-reaching consequences on linguistics in general and historical and comparative linguistics in particular. Generally speaking, as language sounds change regularly and predictably in the course of time, *its vocabulary also develops or expands regularly and predictably*. In other words, proots expressing originally the *same general type* of meaning will develop along parallel lines in the course of history. This is to say that if you know the later derivatives of \*gaW-, you can predict that proots expressing, together with \*gaW-, shades of the same general meaning will also have in common with \*gaW- most derivatives and sometimes the same *means of derivation*. For example, PHS had, in addition to \*gaW-, a number of other proots expressing ‘(different types of) *place*’ like \*baW- and \*kaW-. We should expect such proots to give rise in the course of time to derivatives expressing- *from our point of view*- similar meanings, with each meaning is special and unique in its application or usage. Illustrations are:

3a) The three proots express “*hole* (in the ground, in the side of mountain), *place*”. For \*baW, see §2.9.22 above, and for \*gaW- and \*kaW, see §§2.12.40 above under *Comments* and 2.12.45 above, *the last paragraph*, and 2.1.6.5.4, *Comments II*).

3b) Notions “house, fortress, village” and “field” are expressed by the three proots

---

<sup>276</sup> Suppose, however, that the object is taken into the language from another culture, then there is a good possibility that the language will also borrow the term denoting the new object from the lending culture.



with a suffix \*-r (§§2.3.30, 2.12.40, under *Comments*, and 2.9.22, n. 2f above). Notion of ‘field’ can also be expressed by suffixing -n to \*baW- (§2.9.22 above).

3c) The three proots can express “human being, man” by suffixing -n to \*kaW- (§2.2.13, n. 2 above), zero to \*gaW- (§2.12.40, n. 4, under *Comments* above), and either zero to \*baW (cf. Egyp. bw “people”: see §2.17.76 above) or -n/-r (§2.17.60 above).

3d) Suffixing \*-n to \*baW-, \*kaW-, and \*gaW- gives rise to “build, construct, establish”.

3e) Closely related to ‘field’ is ‘to dig’, which is expressed by suffixing [-r] to \*kaW- and \*gaW-, and nothing to \*baW- (§2.9.22, n. 2a above).

3f) Suffixing /-’/ to \*baW- and \*gaW- gives rise to words expressing “greatness; be great, magnify” as in Egyp. bw’ “be great, marvelous, to magnify”: bw’ “place”, CA ba’wu “greatness, grandness” as a vb bā’a “be arrogant” ~ baw’u “arrogance” = HS [gaW-’] “majesty, greatness, high; arrogance; be great, to magnify” (see §2.2.29 above) = HS [kaW-’] as in CA CVIII ’ktawā “to boast”.

3g) Proots \*gaW- and \*kaW- can take a suffix -n to express “cover”, “protect”, and “darkness”, whereas \*baW- + -n does not express, to my knowledge, “cover”, “protect”, “darkness”.

3h) Proots \*baW-’ = “live, dwell” (§2.9.22 above), \*kaW-n = “to be” also “to dwell, live” (§§2.2.13 & 2.10.3 above), while \*gaW-’ expresses “become; dwelling”.

3i) Proots \*baw-’ and \*gaW-’ express “come, come back, go to, return (home)”, \*kaW- “move”.

The fact that a proot does not express ‘an idea’ denoted by the two other proots, as in n. 3g above, may be due to sound change or to the nature and type of ‘place’ or ‘hole’ originally denotes. More derivatives can be cited, but the time is not ripe for discussing them.

6a) All languages started with monosyllabic proots, i.e. *they proceed from monosyllabism toward polysyllabism*. To account scientifically for the development of languages and explain the differences and similarities found among world’s languages, we should posit a large number of *stages* of language developments and select the appropriate *stage* for each intended study. For example, a comparative study of IE language family and HS language family that aims at establishing genetic relatedness can be best carried out at ‘late first stage’, whereas a similar study of HS language family and Sino-Tibetan language family must be carried out at ‘late zero stage’. Of such stages, the most fundamental and crucial for our study are the earliest two stages: ‘zero stage’ and ‘first stage’, each is a cover term for *many sub-stages*.

6b) *Zero stage* is a stage at which proots or monosyllabic words were used for the purpose of communication and is characterized by the absence of *morphology*, i.e. *devoid of inflectional and derivational morphemes*. It extends into the past indefinitely, to a date we cannot even conjecture. Within the limits of its intrinsic meaning, a proot performs the function of some parts of speech; nouns at this stage, for example, can be used as adjectives and can assume the functions of available particles as some prepositions like *to*, *in*, and, *on*, some demonstratives like ‘*this*’, and some interrogatives.

Prior to the emergence of the verb, sentences were of two simple types put in any order: *n + n* and *adj. + n* as in *hot weather*, *tall mountain*, *I hungry*, or *n + prep. phrase* like *man inside the cave*, *ache in the stomach*, *animal in the valley*, and word order was relatively free; words were often placed more or less at random. However, word order was often dictated by the word to be emphasized in the message, and this word is placed before others as in *sun rising*, where emphasis is on *sun*; otherwise, *rising sun*. The stock of vocabulary was severely limited in the very beginning to terms for *family relationships*, *visible parts of the body*, *to things that can be identified by the senses*, *to some other nouns like walking, moving, laughing, crying*, etc., and to some terms having to do with ‘*deity, god*’ and *ritual*. The phonological system included a small number of distinctive consonant phonemes, three vowels /i, a, u/, and two diphthongs /ai (or ay), au (or aw). The general linguistic characteristics of this period were:

- a) ‘*simplicity*’,
- b) *lack of irregularities and anomalies*, which began to emerge toward the close of this stage, and are now superabundant in morphology and syntax,
- c) the system of communication was *very limited and confined to man’s vital needs*. Putting the same idea in different words, *human communication system*- with its marked complexity, flexibility, and productivity - *has developed from an earlier and simpler signaling system*. In its earliest stage, *the very limited system did not differ in essence from animal communication*. Later differences between *human* and *animal systems* began to grow gradually in the course of *early zero stage* and were wholly due to evolutionary changes in *man’s mind* which ultimately enabled him to make infinite use of finite means (see n. 9b below).

Late in this stage, the verb, phonetically indistinguishable from the noun or adjective throughout the later part of this stage, began to be used only as the following examples may suggest: {I + n. eye} > “I see”, {I + adj. clean} > “I clean, wash”. The past tense appeared very late in this stage and consisted of {the present form, i.e. n. + a proot signifying *the past*}. A similar mechanism of word formation was used much earlier to express ideas like ‘*yesterday*’, ‘*last year*’, and the like (cf. §2.14.14 above).

Toward the end of this period many proots had become permanently attached to other proots in some of their occurrences to form ‘*compounds*’, and some morphological affixes had slowly begun to emerge due to ‘*proot-split*’ (see n. 7a below) and reduction of *proots to affixes* in some of their occurrences. At the lexical side, there were developments parallel to that noticed in morphology.

7) *First stage* is a stage at which morphology flourished and so did compounding and some other methods of word formation, esp. *conversion*. Large numbers of affixes became available through *two ways*:

7a) by reduction of proots to affixes- *to perform certain morphological and syntactic functions, namely, in derivation, inflection, and in conjugation*.

7b) by proot-split, *which was much more common than the former*, whereby a proot came to be used as both *a proot* and *an affix*. This process began in the latter part of ‘*zero stage*’ and has continued to modern times. My analysis of Hamito-Semitic roots

above demonstrates clearly this fact. More illustrative examples are:

i) PHS [šu] “mark, characteristic > name” (see §2.2.48, n. 2i above), later developed into šū “what, who, which; genitive marker, i.e. *belonging to*; for, since, etc.” as in Assyr. šū id., BHeb. “what, who, which, because”, OAram. š “belonging to”, etc.

ii) HS demonstrative δā, together with all its forms (§2.20.3 above), may go back to a noun: *nom.* δū lit. “one possessing, having, one who is”, i.e. صاحب as in the Koran (2: 243, 251; 3:74, etc.).

iii) PHS [baW, paW] “place” > bi-, pī- *in, at*, etc. see §§2.21.6 & 2.21.5 above.

iv) PHS [ma] “place” in gen. HS id. > Egyp. m “in, at, from, out from, etc.” (EHD I, 264): see §2.21.1, n. 2d above, etc.

v) PHS stem [-n-] “rejection, turning aside” in Egyp. ny, ní “to reject, turn aside”; wn “to reject, turn aside” (§2.2.53 above) > n “no, not” (see §2.21.3 above).

vi) PHS stem [‘al] “above, over, upon, on, upward” as in Assyr. eli, OffAram., Palm., JAram., Phoen., Pun., BHeb., BAram., Syr. ‘al (NWSI II, 842-844; OT, 777), CA ‘alā, etc.: CA ‘āli “high”; ‘uluw “height”, Sab. ‘lw id., Egyp. ‘r “stairs” (= Pun. ‘l id., etc.) as a vb Sem.-Egyp. “go up, ascend, rise”.

vii) Akk.-Assyr. mahru prep. “before”, etc. is a compound of three proots (see §2.19 above).

viii) Akk. muhhi “to, over, against” is a compound of two proots (see §2.19 above).

ix) Akk. pānu “before”, Eth. fəna “toward”, etc. see §2.3.28 above.

x) HS stem [‘θr] “place, trace” as in Akk. ašar “place”, CA ‘θr, OAram., Samal, OffAram., Palm., JAram., Nab., BHeb, Pun. ‘šr “place”. This noun has developed in the course of time into:

a) UG. ‘θr “who, what, that”, Mo., BHeb. ‘šr id., etc. (see n. ii above);

b) UG, CA, Sab. ‘θr “after”, etc.

c) Akk.-Assyr. ašar “in, where, during”; ašriš “against”, etc.

xiii) CA, Sab. ḥwl prep. “around” (§2.1.14.3, n. 1c above).

In the course of this *stage* many earlier *compounds*, covering nearly all parts of speech, and complex words consisting of *affixes* + *proots* became indivisible words. The most striking change that took place at this stage was in *phonology* where many of the formerly *conditioned allophones* of phonemes achieved phonemic independence as a result of loss or change of the conditioning environments.

Migrations of people from their original homeland, carrying with them their slightly differentiated dialects, continued incessantly throughout the two stages. Every new wave of migrations wandered in various directions , and finally formed settlements far apart. They mingled with , enslaved, or killed the earlier migrants and settled in their land , unaware of the tie of blood and of speech that subsist between them

Lapse of time and geographical isolation permitted such dispersed dialects to develop on their own ways, caused their formerly slight and predictable differences to grow and deepen increasingly, and gave way to new differences to spring up between them . In the course of events , the divergences became much more conspicuous than the resemblances which had been preserved.

More stages can be posited for the sake of comparative studies among world’s languages. Besides, ‘*first stage*’ is capable of being divided into many other stages as

the intended study may demand.

8) As a general rule that applies to all world's languages without exceptions, we expect the languages of those who moved away from their '*homeland*' at '*zero stage*' and the languages of those who migrated at '*first stage*' and subsequent stages to be similar to one another in *sounds, proots* and their *deep semantic contents*, and different from one another in *three major areas*:

8a) *Vocabulary*. An existing word may change its meaning, a word may die out and a new word is added to perform its function. New words may also be coined or borrowed to meet new conditions or to name previously non-existent objects in the former homeland. In addition, the meaning of existing word may expand its range of application and apply to previously unknown objects or things. This type of change is commonly known as '*semantic extension*', which is so closely connected with man's life, culture, and environment.

8b) *Phonology*. Sounds within an utterance often have an effect on one another and as a result a distinctive sound may develop one or more allophones occurring in different phonological environments. I suppose that allophones were much more common in *final position* rather than in initial position since *final position* of proots is often a conditioning environment for change.

To sum up, similarities among world's languages in sound systems outnumber differences. As we have just mentioned, almost all changes can be accounted for in terms of rules, and nearly all exceptions found can be scientifically explained by taking into consideration the linguistic environments in which they occur.

8c) *Syntax*. Mechanism of the arrangement of words in an utterance in a way that shows the interrelationships among such words for the sake of *understanding* and *intelligibility* and of avoiding ambiguity and indistinctness. This is can be achieved in different ways in languages as in *word order, inflectional affixes, a combination of both*, etc. The differences among languages in this respect bear evidence that a fixed word order, as in *Chinese, Vietnamese*, and other *isolating languages*, is only attainable, logically speaking, after either

i) *a gradual loss of inflection concomitant with the gradual adoption of different means of indicating relationships among the elements of an utterance*. The implementation of a different mechanism does not imply *at all* that former morphological affixes and compound and complex words inherited from late '*zero stage*' have altogether disappeared . There is no language , to my knowledge , has completely lost these features *at all*.

ii) *a long period of confusion affecting 'intelligibility' among speakers*.

On the other hand, the rise of inflection toward the end of '*zero stage*' and throughout '*first stage*' is a natural outcome of n. (ii) (cited above for fixed word order). It appears quite evident that '*fixed word order*' and '*inflection*' have both arisen from '*a need*' necessitated and imposed by the factor of '*intelligibility*'. It can thus be said that '*fixed word order*' and '*inflection*' are no more than '*inventions*' owing their existence to '*a need for intelligibility*'. We may recall here the proverb: '*Need is the mother of all inventions*'. See my view on syntax in §2.17.51, under *Comments* above.

9) The general idea gathered from the foregoing paragraphs should be as follows:

9a) All human languages have sprung up from one single language, which can be scientifically proved, described and reconstructed. The easiest and most promising way to prove '*this origin*' is to take Egyp. and CA as representing Hamito-Semitic family of languages and compare them with all other language families.

Although CA has changed a lot in the course of time- just like any other language, yet it has preserved much more of *the most ancient linguistic forms and features* of Proto-Hamito-Semitic than any of its sister languages. For this reason, CA will certainly occupy among world's languages the very same position it occupies in HS. In other words, *it is the language in which many of the differences found in world's languages in sounds, proots, together with their derivatives, and semantics can be explained and reconciled*. This does not mean at all that other HS languages are not important for the purpose of any intended '*comparative study*'; it is just that CA here is a rewarding '*short cut*'. Nor does it imply under any circumstance that CA is a near approximation to the original speech; *this is an absurd, since PHS itself may not be as such*. However, for what concerns '*the form of the primeval proots only*', monosyllabic languages alone approach this origin, bearing in mind that such languages have, *like all other languages*, changed considerably in the course of time, and the *very limited comparative study* (n. 10 below) between HS and Archaic Chinese will show clearly this fact.

9b) All human languages show the same level of structural complexity and all share general abstract properties, *this is to say that all languages can be analyzed as systems consisting of structural units, each with its proper units and rules of permissible combination and order*. All languages are equally capable of expressing any idea and are absolutely adequate to the needs of their users. There are still many primitive peoples, e.g. *some American Indian tribes, some aboriginal tribes of Australia*, etc., whose ways of life have not changed for thousands of years and yet their languages are as systematic, complex, and useful as other languages found in any other part of the world. This is evidence that '*complexity of language structure*' is uncorrelated with '*degrees of cultural advancement*'. Moreover, all languages are acquired by children with the same rate and with equal ease, and any child has an innate capacity to discover the '*underlying theory*' of his language after uttering few phrases of that language. The *sole reason* for this '*acquisition*' and this '*remarkable discovery*' is that all languages are *subsequent variations of one original tongue*, and that any normal child born anywhere in the world is capable of acquiring any human language to which he is exposed; *he knows how to use it, how to combine words together into sentences, how to identify language patterns, and how to generate grammar*, exactly as he knows *how to walk*. He is destined to acquire this type of speech or *signaling communication system* and its complex rules- *without study and without instruction*, but not any other types of *communication systems* employed by other creatures (animals, birds, bees, etc.)<sup>277</sup>

---

<sup>277</sup> For example, *chimpanzees* can use vocalizations to warn of danger, to signal the finding of food, to express the desire for food, to communicate aggressiveness and subordination, to indicate attitudes to mating, etc.; *bird calls* convey messages associated with feeding, danger,

sharing with him the same environment. The same concept seems to apply to all species, where *each is capable of acquiring only its own system which implies that each system is biologically innate*.

The marked difference between *man* and *other creatures* in the subject under discussion is that man is *creative* in his ability to use and develop the language which is apparently due to the structure of his brain (see n. c, under 6b above), whereas other creatures have *communication systems* meeting their vital needs and their environment demands, but do not seem to have developed beyond such needs. For the *origin of language*, see n. 11 below.

9c) A closely related to the idea expressed in the two forgoing paragraphs is *the existence of a direct relationship between meaning and word, a topic has already been touched upon in connection with Ibin Jinni's theory* as outlined in §2.2.51 above, *the last two paragraphs*. As has already been mentioned (9a above), language change<sup>278</sup>, which has taken place in the course of millennia, has made this relationship as well as the relationship among world's languages difficult to discern. For this reason, all linguists *unanimously* take a pride in the groundless claim that language is 'arbitrary' or 'conventional' without thinking of *a simple fact as clear as sunshine* that as 'L' (L = language) changes in time and ultimately splits into different languages 'Li', 'Lii', 'Liii', etc. Later on, communication between speakers of 'Li', 'Lii', 'Liii', etc. becomes impossible because, as proponents of 'arbitrariness' say, there is no connection between the 'linguistic form' that each of such languages uses and the thing it refers to. However, if we go back in time to 'L', we will certainly find that the connection between 'linguistic form' and 'meaning' is quite evident. Accordingly, we can say, *as a rule*, that the term 'arbitrary' applies only to 'later stages' of language (e.g. *Li* = *Latin*) and is *only* a necessary condition for the existence of different languages (e.g. *Li*, *Lii*, *Liii*, etc. = *the Romance languages*). You may substitute Proto-Hamito-Semitic for Latin, and Hamito-Semitic languages for the Romance languages, and so on, until you get to Proto-World Language.

9d) As has already been mentioned, all world's languages are genetically related. 'Failure' of scholars to prove such genetic relatedness should only mean that *the relationship exists, but such scholars lack the requisite knowledge to prove it and have no idea about the real structure of language*. Otherwise, we are unintentionally and wrongly considering such scholars to be at the summit of knowledge, i.e. *where they*

---

*nesting, attracting mates, pleasure, distress, territorial defense, aggression, etc.*; dolphins can communicate information on *food, danger*, etc. by means of whistles, etc.

It is true that *a chimpanzee*, for example, uses a fixed system of signals and can communicate information only about things for which it has such signals, whereas *man* can talk about anything he sees, expects, or imagines. The greater *flexibility, productivity, and precision* of human communication system arose from the structural complexity of 'grammar', which his creative mind had developed.

<sup>278</sup> Including esp. *phonological changes* with all its types, *loss of words* and *the rise of new words to express their meanings, borrowing, and semantic change* with all its types

*have failed, no one will ever succeed.*

As has already been mentioned, world's languages and the linguistic field are still a *virgin land* waiting with *patience* and *persistent yearning* for a passer-by to enter it or, *at least*, to *draw near it*. With the notable exceptions of very few old Arab passers-by, all worldwide scholars have contented themselves with looking into *the virgin land* from *afar* without *entering it* or even *drawing near it*.

In taking into account *stages* of language evolution as spelled out above and of millennia of separation and independent development, we will come to the logical conclusion that related world's languages have come to be remarkably different to the extent that their genuine cognates are- *prior to this research*- impossible to recognize.

Besides language change, *there are still the following three other weighty reasons* for linguists' failure, of which the first (in n. i below) is the most important:

i) From what I have read, it becomes quite obvious that all world's scholars, including Semitists, are not well informed about Classical Arabic and the old Arab scholars' works on it like those of Farāhīdi, Bin Faris and Ibin Jinni.

ii) As mentioned earlier, linguists have failed to gain *deeper insights* into the structure of language and its evolutionary tendencies that would enable them to discover new facts and break new ground in the field so as to widen the horizon of comparative linguistics by proving new genetic relationships between known families of languages. The scholars to blame are *the Indoeuropeanists*, who have set up an *impotent* method for the linguistic investigation not only of Indo-European, but also of all languages.

There is no denying, however, that much has been done in the field of language studies in general and comparative linguistics in particular since the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, but such studies have to all intents and purposes dealt with the *surface structures* of all language components, leaving their *underlying structures virtually untouched*. Scholars have worldwide contented themselves with data-collection, with surface descriptions of languages, with detailed studies and comparisons of their sounds, words, and grammars, with long lists of cognates of individual language families, with the reconstruction of complex and compound words as *proto-roots*, and with laying down standards and criteria on how languages should be compared and which levels of language structure is important for establishing relationships between languages. The last named demands some brief clarification.

Scholarly opinions differ on whether similarity of *grammatical structure* or *word correspondences* is a valid criterion for establishing genetic relatedness between languages. For some scholars, esp. *the Indoeuropeanists*, the former is more important than the latter. Some other scholars believe that sharing '*basic vocabulary*' could be an indication of genealogical relationship. For some others, like Joseph Greenberg and his associates, *genetic relationship* can be established by the method of '*mass lexical comparison*', i.e. *the comparison of several languages at the same time*, which reflects an attempt to overcome the limitations of the comparative method. Another equally unreliable and premature hypothesis similar to '*mass comparison*' but not exactly the same is the *Nostratic*, which proceeds mainly from surface similarities between words to classify large numbers of language families (IE, HS, Uralic, Altaic, Dravidian

languages, etc.) into a putative language family. The hypothesis reflects truly *the wish* of its supporters more than anything else since there is indeed nothing else to mention, and its findings, in case if any, convince no one but its supporters, whose knowledge of the languages they deal with arouses my pity. To know the real reason why this attempt is a waste of time and failure, read *the last paragraph* of the *Preface* above. There are still few scholars who assume that languages sharing in common a number of *specific words* are genetically related. G. Von der Gabelentz (quoted by Forrest, 1948: 23) writes: “...in Indo-Chinese (i.e. Sino-Tibetan languages) the words for ‘I’, ‘five’, ‘fish’ have as a rule the sounds *nga*, *ngya*, or *such like*, and those for ‘you’, ‘two’, ‘ear’, *na*, or perhaps *nang*, *no*, *ni*; finally, ‘fire’ and ‘eye’ coincide in sounds like *mig*, *mit*, *mi*. If these agreements, or a majority of them, are found in a language, then this language may be regarded without further ado as Indo-Chinese”.

All such opinions have entirely overlooked one important fact that language changes in the course of time, and that the change is not limited to one domain of language structure, but equally affect all domains. Ironically, all such scholars talk about *language change* in their books, but they quickly forget it when they sit in dark rooms to formulate their futile theories. *Hasn’t the time come for linguistics to mature?* Are ‘inflection’, ‘basic vocabulary’, and ‘three sets of Chinese words’ immune of language change?<sup>279</sup> The absolute truth is that ‘grammatical cases’ in inflectional languages and ‘basic vocabulary’ in all languages are, like those of HS discussed above, products of language change and independent development in each language or a group of closely related languages. Therefore, they can be used *only* as indicators of ‘degrees of relationship’ and of ‘stages of evolution’.

The sole valid criterion for establishing relationships between language families is spelled out below.

*All languages are sound and all human beings produce speech sounds with essentially the same equipment. Such sounds are strung together in every language in certain way to make larger units such as syllables and words. Unlike other components of language (e.g. inflections) sounds are the only component that change for the most part in a predictable way and can therefore be accounted for in terms of rules (8b above). Accordingly, the surest and most reliable criterion for comparing languages is sound correspondences among ‘primeval proots’ as have been defined in this research.*

Other components of language, esp. *morphology with its two sub-branches: inflection and word formation* are of important considerations only in comparing different stages of the developments of languages and determining with certainty the sort of ‘genetic relationship’ between language families whether it is close or distant.

The foregoing paragraph has not been written to escape ‘comparative grammar’ between language families (see the paragraph below), but rather to guide future studies

---

<sup>279</sup> Another important question concerning the sets of Chinese words presents itself here: *Are such words primeval proots, in the sense that they have not undergone any changes over time?* One single example may be sufficient to answer the question: HS [m], as in Egyp., signifies both “to burn; fire” and “to see; eye” is the product of linguistic change and is not a *primeval proot*.



to areas in language structure yielding much more interesting results.

As we will see in the following chapter, IE and HS, *like some other families*, share in common not only *primeval proots* and *later roots* (i.e. *compound and complex roots*), but also inflectional affixes and methods of word formation. This is an indicator that their separation occurred late in time, and that ‘*first stage*’ above ought to be divided into a number of stages.

iii) The third reason for ‘*linguists’ failure*’ is that any similarity noted among languages has never been studied scientifically by linguists in an attempt to determine its ultimate cause or source, but rather ascribed to either *borrowing* or *chance*<sup>280</sup>. It is a well-established fact that *prolonged contact* between speakers of different languages will result, *under definable conditions*, in the adoption of loanwords. The degree of contact and consequently the number of loanwords may vary very considerably from language to language. This does not mean, however, that every single word found in one language bearing phonetic and semantic resemblance to a word found in another language *must be due to chance or a loan* in one of them as *all eminent and professional linguists*- like Indoeuropeanists<sup>281</sup> and their disciples throughout the world- *wrongly believe*. This special topic has already been dealt with in §2.24 above. The similarities in question may be due to ‘*borrowing*’ or to ‘*genetic relatedness*’ *but never to chance*, which has always been used by linguists as a *pretext* or ‘*scape-goat*’ to escape explanations they are *neither capable of nor qualified for*<sup>282</sup>.

Since ‘*borrowing*’ in a language is seldom limited to one donor, and language takes over words from several languages, anyone writes on this topic must be equipped with deep knowledge of the languages concerned that would enable him to explain thoroughly his choice. Accordingly, all works on ‘*borrowing*’, excluding no one, *have to be drastically revised*.

**10) Should we consider the following examples of remarkable resemblance between Sino-Tibetan family, represented mainly by Archaic Chinese, and Hamito-Semitic**

---

<sup>280</sup> For example, Proto-Uralic \*nime- “name” = PIE nomen-; \*wete- “water” = PIE \*weden/wodor; \*ke-, \*ku- “who, what” = PIE \*k<sup>w</sup>e, \*k<sup>w</sup>o; \*te-, \*to- “this, that” = PIE \*te-, to-, and so forth.

<sup>281</sup> Among the first Indoeuropeanists to spread this *rumor* was Rasmus Rask in his ‘*An Investigation into the origin of the Old Nordic or Icelandic Language*’ (1818). He stresses that *lexical correspondence* is an unreliable criterion for establishing genetic relatedness between languages since such correspondences might be due to either *borrowing* or *pure chance*. All scholars without exceptions have adopted this surmise and looked upon many similarities between languages and language families as being the *product of chance*.

<sup>282</sup> Apart from the fact that most of those who have written on ‘*borrowing*’ are obviously unqualified to deal with this subject, there is still one weighty reason compelling me to write on this topic in §2.24 above and then bring it up here. Some linguists reject the whole concept of ‘*an ancestor language*’ and ‘*language family*’, and attempt to explain the similarities found between related languages as a result of extensive borrowing between such languages.

family, represented mainly by CA and Egyp.<sup>283</sup>, as due to ‘borrowing’, ‘chance’, or indicators of relationship?

1) ACh.<sup>284</sup> ʔhua “fire”, P. hwo, C., H. fɔ, F. hur id.<sup>285</sup> = Egyp. hw id., CA s-hy (see §2.2.38 above).

2) ACh. hau “good”, P. hau, C. hou, A. ho id. = CA hai id. (see §2.19 above and also §2.1.14.2, ft 1, under *Comments* above).

3) ACh. hiwet “blood”, P. ɛyɛ, C. hy:t, H. het, F. hi, S. fye’ id. = CA hawā “blood (coming down from the nose).

4) ACh. hyi “joy”, P. ɛi, C he:i, S. jī id. = Egyp. hyw “fall into ecstasy”, caus. shsh, SL sahsah (see §2.1.14.2, ft 1, under *Comments* above). All are related to words in n. 2 above.

5) ACh. hai “sea” = Egyp. h’ “marsh, swamp” also “name of a lake”.

6) ACh. h'an “sacrifice” = Egyp. hwī “sacrifice”, and with /-n/, as in ACh., hwnw “animals for sacrifice”. Logic dictates that a term for ‘sacrifice’ cannot exist before the ‘thing, e.g. animal, etc.’ used for this purpose. Accordingly, ‘sacrifice’ is a later development from a proot [huw] “cow”. The proot is seen in Egyp. hw “cattle for sacrifice” and in CA huw-ār pl. “the characteristic noises produced by a cow”.

7) ACh. hek “black”, P. he id.

ACh. word as it stands is very difficult, if not impossible, to pronounce. It is somewhat easier to pronounce it by transposing its sounds as in CA kāh “dark” ~ kǎh “dark and black” or repeating the same sound twice as in kāk ~ kǎk id., Egyp. hhw “darkness, night”, kk, id. etc., caus. shw “darken”.

8) ACh. ham “to cry” = CA hammu arch. “crying exceedingly” and, to my knowledge, it has no vb form.

9) ACh. kua “fruit”, P. kuo id. = Egyp. k'w id.

10) ACh. k'wo “go” = Egyp. kw, kyw “to move”, perh. CA ka'ka' “run, as a thief does”.

11) ACh. k'uo “bitter”, P. k'u, F. k'u id. = Egyp. k'k' “plant with bitter taste”.

12) ACh. kak “each” = Egyp. kí “other, another”: see §2.1.1, n. g above.

13) ACh. kai “change”, P. kai, C. koi, S. kæ id. = CA kā'a “turn away (from)”.

15) ACh. k'əu “hillock” = Egyp. k'w “be high” ~ k' id.; k'k' “hill”.

16) Ancient Ch. kâ “to sing”, k'ie “singing-girl” = Egyp. k' “to sing”.

17) Ancient Ch. kiek “to beat” = Egyp. k'k id.

18) Ancient Ch. kiei “hen” = Egyp. kím id.

19) Ancient Ch. kât “to cut” = CA kǎtǎ id.

20) ACh. kwei “to move” = Egyp. kw id.

21) ACh. g'juŋ “poor”, P. k'un, F. kyn id. = Egyp. g'-t “poverty”.

<sup>283</sup> The examples are taken from my unpublished comparative study of HS and Sino-Tibetan families. They have carefully been selected to avoid a lot of explanations and comments. See Forrest, R.A.D, 1950; Karlgren, Bernhard 1931 & 1949.

<sup>284</sup> Archaic Chinese, *an older form of Ancient Chinese*.

<sup>285</sup> P = Pekingese; C = Cantonese; H = Hakka; F. = Fuchow; S. = Suchow.

- 22) ACh. guó “country”, P. eia/eiaŋ id. = CA ġau “district, settlement of a tribe”.
- 23) ACh. g ‘lən “near”, P. tein, C. k ‘an id. = Egyp. ḳy’ id.
- 24) ACh. g ‘luət “dig” > P. ṭeỵɛ, C. kwat, F. kuʼ id. = Chad.: Zaaŋ gi “dig”, Kera ge “bury”, Buduma gau id., Cush.: Afar gíʼ id. (HSED, n. 875).
- 25) ACh. guò “to pass” = CA ġāya’a “to pass by and meet”, from ġā’a “to come”
- 26) ACh. mʼu “not”, P. wu id., Ancient Ch. mwât id. ~ ACh. mjwaŋ “not”, P. waŋ id. = CA mā id.: see §2.21.4 above.
- 27) ACh. mʼwəŋ “look”, P. waŋ, C. mən, H. mən, S. mā id. = Egyp. mʼ “look at, see”: see n. 24 below.
- The same word also expresses in ACh. “bright”, P. miŋ id. = Egyp. mʼw “softness”; mʼw-t “brilliance, splendor, light”.
- 28) ACh. mywei “eyebrow”, P. mei id.: ACh. m̥əỵ “pupil of the eye”, m̥uŋ “eye”, Tib. myig “eye” = Egyp. mʼ “look at, see”, mʼʼ “eyebrow”: CA māwiya-tu fem. “mirror”. For the close relationship between ‘eye; to see’ and ‘mirror’, see §§2.1.6.5.9, n. f and 2.10.11 above.
- 29) ACh. mʼuən “ask”, P. wən id. = CA ma’ana “to inform, make learn or know about”, CX ’istam’ana (unrecorded) would necessarily signify “to inquire, ask about”: cf. CA ’a’lama = *ma’ana* in meaning; CX ’ista’lam “to inquire, ask about” *must* = ’istam’ana.
- 30) ACh. mai “together”, P. mai id. = Egyp. my “together with”. Note that CA compound ma’ “with”; ma’-an “together (with)” is not a direct cognate; it is rather a distant cognate. See §2.10, n. 6a above.
- 31) ACh. b ‘ua “old woman”, P. p ‘o id. = Egyp. bw’ “grand-mother”.
- 32) ACh. bʼuok “servant”, P. pʼu, H. pʼuk, C. puk, F. puʼ id. = Egyp. byk “servant, slave”.
- 33) ACh. b ‘a:i “stop”, P. pa id. = Egyp. yb id. The Egyp. form is most likely *caus*. For a similar instance see n. 64 below.
- 34) ACh. bù “a measure” = Egyp. b’ “a measure (for liquid, for grain)”.
- 35) ACh. bèi “by” = CA bi id.
- 36) ACh. báí “white” = Egyp. bʼ “white substance”.
- 37) ACh. puai “cup”, P. pei id. = Egyp. py, p’ “cup”: see §2.17.83.17 above.
- 38) ACh. pʼəu, pjwei “not”, P. pei id. Also *bu* “not” = Egyp. bw “not”: see §2.21.5 above.
- 39) ACh. pʼua “to break”, P. p ‘o, C. p ‘ɔ, F. p ‘ɔ id. = CA fa’ā or fa’awa “to split, cleave, break”.
- 40) ACh. pʼwei “to fly”, P. fei, C. fe:i, H. fui, A. pi id. = Egyp. pwí “to fly”: see §2.14.16 above.
- 41) ACh. pʼwen “side”, P. piən, C. pi:n, H. p̣en, F. peŋ id. = Egyp. pa’ “side, edge”, etc. see §3.11.29, n. 9 above.
- 42) ACh. pwat “eight”, P. pa, C. H. pat id. = Egyp. fdw “four”.
- 43) ACh. pi = Egyp. pí ~ py *a demonstrative pronoun*.
- 44) ACh. ʼak “bad, wicked”, P. o, C. ɔk, H. ɔk, S. ɔʼ id. = CA ’akka-tu “rancor”.
- 45) ACh. ʼien “smoke”, P. jen, C. ji:n, H. j̣en, S. i id. = CA ’uwāmu id., Egyp. ’m “flame” (§2.17.1 above)

- 46) ACh. <sup>ʿ</sup>1et “one”, P. i, C. jat, H. jit id. = Egyp. <sup>ʿ</sup> id.  
 47) ACh. <sup>ʿ</sup>ai “clothing”, P. i, F. i, H. i, C. ji id. = Egyp. <sup>ʿ</sup>y-t “a garment” (SL <sup>ʿ</sup>awā<sup>ʿ</sup>i “clothing” is from a different root).  
 48) ACh. <sup>ʿ</sup>an “peace”, P. an, C. ɔn, H. ɔn id. = CA <sup>ʿ</sup>aunu “tranquility and mildness or meekness”.  
 49) ACh. šwi “water”, P. šuei id., Tib. tʃ<sup>ʿ</sup>u id. = šaW “water” (§2.8.12 above).  
 50) ACh. šieu “few”, P. šau id. = CA šawā id., dial. šway.  
 51) ACh. š<sup>ʿ</sup>eu “burn”, P. špu, H. šau id. = CA šawā: see §§2.17.33-34 above.  
 52) ACh. tan “single”, P. tan id. = CA taw “single, one”, Egyp. tw “one”. The addition of /-n/ to the CA form = *indefinite article*. The full form is nom. sg. *tauwun*.  
 53) ACh. tuo “town”, P. tu id. = Egyp. ty-t “country”.  
 54) ACh. t<sup>ʿ</sup>u “earth” = Egyp. t<sup>ʿ</sup> id., CA -ṭa<sup>ʿ</sup> (in compounds) id.: see §2.17.29 above.  
 55) ACh. na “that” = Egyp. n<sup>ʿ</sup> “this”.  
 56) ACh. nei “which” = Egyp. ní “through which”.  
 57) ACh. niu “ox, cow”, Egyp. nw “stall-fed oxen”.  
 58) ACh. nien “year” (P. niɛn, C. ni:n, H. nen) id. = Egyp. nw “time”.

*The following observations should be noted:*

10a) Many of the Chinese and HS above-cited words are compounds, i.e. *consisting of two proots or a proot plus an affix*. For example, Chinese and Egyp. words in n. 31 above are compounds of [ba<sup>ʿ</sup>] “soul, creature, i.e. *has a soul*” as in Egyp. b<sup>ʿ</sup> id. plus [wa<sup>ʿ</sup>] “old” as in Egyp. <sup>ʿ</sup>w “old”, also w<sup>ʿ</sup> “something happening *a long time ago*”.

Another example is Chinese *pwat* “eight” and its Egyp. cognate *fdw* “four”<sup>286</sup> (n. 42 above). A natural question arises here: *Why is it that the same word expresses in Chinese ‘eight’ and in Egyp. ‘four’?* Other questions may be: *Is the difference due to semantic change or to some other factors? What is the ultimate origin of the word?* The following is a *tentative attempt* to reconcile the difference in meaning by establishing a possible origin.

CA *pawtu* is a term for the *tiny openings seen between fingers*, as we stretch the hand and bring the fingers next to one another. If we count these *openings* we will find that they are ‘four’ in number in each hand. The Egyptians count *the openings of one hand*, whereas the Chinese count *the openings of both hands*. For HS [pau] “opening”, see §2.11.29, n. 5b above. The very same ‘four openings’ are also seen *between the fingers of the foot*.

#### *Comments I*

Let us ‘*clinch the hand*’, as in *boxing*, i.e. *making the hand closed tightly with the fingers bent against the palm*. In keeping the hand in this position, *small bones* (or *joints* of fingers and palm) will rise and project or jut out on the back of the palm. As we count these visible *bones*, we will find that they are either **four** or **five** in number in each hand, depending on whether the thumb is or is not included. Some old Arab scholars *exclude the thumb* and count ‘*four small bones*’ and some others *include the thumb* and

<sup>286</sup> Copt. ftou “four”, PChad. \*pd- as in Ngizim fudu “four”, perh. Cush.: Som. afar id.

count ‘five’ (LA). Such *bones of the fingers* are called in CA *barāġim* pl., its sg. form is *burġumatu* fem. The /-m-/ is orig. a pl. suffix, becoming a part of the root.

By shifting the radicals of [brġ], we get *rawāġibu*, which expresses according to LA (r. rġb), “*joints of fingers from the side of the palm, with each finger having 3 joints, except the thumb, which has one*”. Saying that *the thumb* has one joint implies that each remaining finger has 2 joints (**not three**). Moreover, depending on whether *the thumb*’s joint is *included* or *excluding*, the respective number of joints may be 9 or 8. The term *rawāġibu* also denotes “the knots (or joints) of the fingers from the opposite side”, whose number could be *five*<sup>287</sup>.

An ultimate relation between this word and the following words should not be dismissed: *barka’a-tu* “rising on four legs”, said of an animal. It is possible that *birġi’u* “the 4<sup>th</sup> sky” is variant, etc. Although all such words share in common an infix /-r-/, the question whether they are ultimately related remains open. It goes without saying that, by now, the reader knows well my view on /r/ and other *resonants*, as well as, on the feature ‘voice’ (cf. §§2.15.29, 2.17.51, under *Comments*, etc.). This view will be further discussed and illustrated in Chapter III, esp. in §3.16.18 and §3.9.39 below.

What we have so far seen of CA is only a part of the total picture. To complete the picture, the following 3 derivatives must be taken into account:

i) SL and other dialects t(a)-žabbad “to yawn”, i.e. *stretch both arms* (see §2.12.17, ft <sup>1</sup> above for the Egyp. cognate).

ii) By inserting /-r-/ (due here to dissim.): SL t(a)-žarbad may render “seize with the both hands”.

iii) CA baġdu “100 (*horses*)” also “a group of (e.g. people)”. The insertion of /-r-/ after /b-/ gives rise to quadriliteral *barġadu* “large striped garment” < biġādu id., perh. orig. referring to *the number of stripes*.

To revert to Chinese *pwat*, the word is related to *pvk* “100”. A possible HS cognate is CA *fawġu* (or *fauġu*) “a large number (of people)”, pl. ’afwāġu ~ ’afāwiġu ~ (rare) fu’ūġu. The word is most commonly used as a *military term* = 4 *sarāyā*, pl. of *sariyya-tu*. *Sariyya-tu* may include, depending on the military division, a maximum number of 120 soldiers. This shows that *fawġu* is a term originally denotes “from 4 to 5 hundreds”, “hundreds”, or “four of (a thing)”.

### Comments II

Concerning the Chinese numerals above, the most fundamental question arises: *What is the relationship between number “8” and number “100” and how it can be explained?* We are accustomed to see a kind of relation between “10” and “100” (cf. Egyp. *mt* “10” = CA and common Sem. *mi’atu* “100”).

### Comments III

<sup>287</sup> There seems to be a close relationship between “fingers”, counting “joints/knots”, and “numerals”. Among other special terms expressing, like *barāġimu* above, “openings between fingers” as well as “fingers” is CA *šurūġu*. The most important question arises here: *Is there any ultimate relation between this CA term and ’a-šāġi’u* pl. “the base of the five fingers”, “tips of the fingers”, etc.? See LA (r. šġ’ and r. rġb).

Chinese *pwat* and *pvk* are identified with Tibetan *brgyad* “8” and *brgya* “100” respectively. For other possible cognates in the Sino-Tibetan family of languages, see Karlgren 1931: 39ff. The identity of the Tibetan and Chinese numerals has led scholars working on *Sino-Tibetan languages* to build a theory that *the Chinese monosyllables* (as in *pwat*, etc.) *are compressed from earlier polysyllables*. On the other hand, this identity implies that Tibetan surface *br-* = Chinese *p-*, and that Tibetan *-gya-* = Chinese *-k-*.

On the sound equivalences between Chinese and Tibetan, Karlgren (1931: 37) sees that Chinese and Tibetan «*have gone very widely apart: the grammatical system is very different, the words we can identify with certainty are already very dissimilar. The two languages are indeed but remotely cognate. It stands to reason that if it should be possible, one day, really to reconstruct their common mother tongue, this will but little resemble Tibetan, and still less, perhaps, Chinese*».

#### Comments IV

Finally, the most fundamental question arises here: *Do CA fawǵu and \*bawǵu (> brg, rgb) go back to one single form?* Other crucial questions are: *Is /-t ~ -d/ of Egyp. fdw and Chinese pawt a proot for ‘double, pair’? Isn’t that /-t ~ -d/ from an earlier interdental fricative?*

Another question of far reaching effects on world’s languages: *Isn’t \*pau ~ \*bau a primeval proot for ‘finger’?* It is possible that HS [rb’], pronounced fem. ’*a-rba*’*u*, masc. ’*a-rba*’*atu* had a velar or uvular in the vicinity of /-’/, and that this sound has been dropped for seq. const. \*’*arbaǵ*’-. There is one definite answer to all such questions, which is ‘yes’. To the proot under discussion belong hundreds of traditional roots, esp. in CA.

10b) Most Chinese words with initial affricate /ts-/ = Egyp.-CA words with surface /s-/ , e.g.

59) ACh. tsi “son”, P. tsɿ, S. tsi, A. tʃi id. = Egyp. s’ id.

60) ACh. ts’wok “foot”, P. tsu, H. tsiuk id., Ancient Chinese tsjuk id. = CA swḵ in sāḵ “leg”, Egyp. sbḵ id.

61) ACh. tsuo “grand-father”, P. tsu, H. tsu, F. tʃu id. = CA \*si(w) id. This *masculine* form, like a very small number of words (4 or 5) of its type<sup>288</sup>, was lost in the course of time. Its *feminine* form *sittu* (< siw-tu), however, have been kept intact not only in CA, but also in most other Semitic languages: Ug. št “lady”. All go back to [si’] “master”: see below.

62) ACh. ts’a “elder” = Egyp. compound word *sr* id. (also = English *sir*) which is from \*sa’ or \*si’ + -r, which is a term for “man”. One may rightly ask: *can this analysis be proved scientifically?*

I have assigned to proot [si’] above (n. 61 above) a signification “*master*”, i.e. ‘first in rank, in appearance, in existence, in strength, in leadership, etc., grand-father, chief, son, god, person, etc. and their feminine counterparts’. This proot, like any other proot discussed above such as [‘a’], [ba’], etc., can be combined with other proots to create

<sup>288</sup> See masc. \*’ama: fem. ’ama-tu in §2.15.23, *the last paragraph* above. In addition, Sem. fem. šā-’u ~ šā-tu: masc. \*šā (ft <sup>1</sup> in §2.1.5 above), etc.

new words.

For example, to express “*first-born*” in Egyp., combine proot [saʾ] with proot *ms* “child, son”, and the result is a compound *sms* “first-born”. One can also add [ʾaʾ], [ʾaʾ], etc. to [ms] to create new words expressing related meanings in HS languages (§2.14.64 above). Another common HS compound word comprising proot [saʾ] is perh. seen in *saḥaru* “dawn”, i.e. \*saʾ-ḥar: see §2.2.32 above.

63) ACh. tsʾa “early”, H. tsia, F. tʿia, A. tʿi id.: see n. 62 above.

64) ACh. tsəu “to run”, P. tsou id. = perh. Egyp. sy “to go away, depart”; caus. ys “make to pass quickly, make haste” (§2.3. above), yss “to run” = CA CII: see §2.1.7.3.

### *Remarks on HS & Chinese Grammars*

As we have already seen, the whole grammatical system of HS is essentially based on the modification of the root meaning through the addition of affixes or/and modification of vocalic elements to express grammatical functions like *tense*, *number*, *case*, etc., lexical categories like *nouns*, *verbs*, etc., and to derive new words.

In what follows, we will be concerned with methods of *word formation*, esp. *derivation*, in both Chinese (*Archaic & Ancient*), *Classical Arabic* and *Egyptian*. It will be shown clearly that the difference between Chinese and HS in the subject concerned lies only in *productivity*, which is to say that a linguistic feature is common to both, but that it is *more productive* and *common* in one of them than the other. The criterion of ‘*productivity*’ also extends to any linguistic feature that was common at an earlier stage of a language, but gradually lost its vitality and ability to enter into new combinations at later stages. For example, such Old English prefixes as *for-* as in *forsake*, and *with-* “against” as in *withstand* have now no vitality and are no longer used to create new words.

Chinese uses sound alternations and affixes, i.e. *suffixes* and *prefixes*, to create derivatives from a stem as the following examples show:

65) ACh. ʾak “bad, wicked” (n. 44 above): ʾag “to deem bad” > “to hate”.

66) ACh. pʾwən “to divide”: bʾwən “part, share” (cf. Forrest, 1950: 115), but pʾwən “a part, a share”: bʾwən “to divide, to share” (cf. Karlgren 1949: 91) = CA faʾ- & baʾ-: see §§2.8.17-2.8.18 above

Examples of sound alternations from CA are *kabā* “trash, refuse”: *ḫabā* “to clean trash or refuse”; ʾakku “very hot”; ʾakka-tu fem. id. ~ ʾagġa-tu id. It is ʾagġa (CV ta-ʾagġaġa) that has been the most commonly used as a verb “to burn, flame up, etc.” throughout the history of the language (see §2.5.8 above). An example from Egyp. may be ʾtw “injury, harm”; ʾt “loss”: ʾdī “be wounded”; ʾdʾ “to suffer injury or loss”.

67) ACh. kian “to see” (active verb): gʾian “be seen, appear” (passive) = Egyp. gʾ “to see, look”; gʾgʾ “to ogle, make eyes at” & ḳʾḳʾ “to look at, peep, pry into”. See §§2.1.6.5.6 & 2.1.6.5.7 above.

68) ACh. kân “shield”: gʾân “to shield” = CA ġunna-tu “shield”; inst. *mi-gannu*, Akk. *maginnu* id.: see §2.1.6.5.4, n. c above. I add *kanna* “to protect, cover, safeguard”; *kinnu* “anything that protects”, with f-extension: *kanīfu* “shield”. The *inst.* form, which has been preserved in all Sem. languages, proves that [gan] was once used in Sem. to express “to shield”.

69) Ancient Chinese tsjuk “foot”: tsjěk “footprint” (n. 60 above).

70) Ancient Chinese ngjǎn “to speak” : ngjǎn “a saying” : gǐwǎn “has said” : gǐwǎt “says, said”: gǐwǎd “to say to”: g’wad “word” = CA nāğa, ġa’-, etc. see §§2.11.55-2.11.58 above. I add ġauwada “to intone or modulate in reciting” whose final /-d/ may be from an earlier /-t/ and the original form was n. \*ġauwa-tu (= ta-ġwīdu “intoning in reciting): \*ġaw-tu “a sound, a word”. Of the two reconstructed words, ġawtu exists in Poet. as in «kamā (= as) ru’tu (= I frightened) bi (with) ġawta “a sound, a call” (’a)ḏ-ḏimā’a (’a)ṣ-ṣawādiyā» LA.

71) Ancient Chinese b’jd “to ruin”: b’wad id. = CA bāda, etc. see §2.3.3 above.

72) Ancient Chinese mǎg “a cover”: mōg “to cover” = CA -ġā, -ġa “to cover”; -ġu ~ -ġū “a cover”: see §2.2.37 above.

73) Ancient Chinese d’og “to run away”: d’jog “to run to”<sup>289</sup> = CA daġġa “to hasten, walk”, a cpd of [da-] either caus. or “move” plus proot [’ag] “fast, quick”.

74) Ancient Chinese ân “how” ~ jân id. = CA ’annā id., Egyp. yn-n’ *an interrogative*.

75) ACh. kǎn “interval, space between”: g’ǎn “interval in time, leisure” = CA ’anā-tu “taking one’s time”; as a vb ta’annā; CX ’ista’ni *imper.* “don’t be in a hurry”; ’āna “delay, linger”; ’anā, ’inā, ’anayu, ’inyu “a moment of time, hour” = Egyp. nwt “interval of rest” also “a moment of time” (yntnt, with prefixed \*’-, “withdrawal, delay”): nw “time, hour”. Chinese initial velars are proots: see §2.17.83 above.

76) ACh. yüan “far” = CA na’yu “farness”; nā’in “far”: see §2.8.22, esp. n. 2 above.

**11)** Speculation on the origin of language dates from the time when man first began to ask such perplexing questions as *how language began* and *who created it*. The first answers to such questions were theological and every human culture attributed its creation to its *god*. Egyptians attributed it to *Toth*, Babylonians to *Nabu*, the Hindus to *Sarasvati*, a *female god*, Chinese to Emperor *T’ien-tzu*, the *son of heaven*. According to Judaic, Christian and Islamic beliefs, God created *Adam*, *father of mankind*, and taught him how to speak. Similar *myths* about the creation of man and/or language by a deity are found in nearly all cultures- Japanese, American Indians, etc. Besides such *myths*, a large number of *equally ridiculous theories* are found on this topic like ‘*bow-waw*’, ‘*singsong*’, ‘*ding-dong*’, etc., with each theory trying to explain- in a way far removed from reality- *how human language could have originated in the world*.

As has been mentioned in n. 9b above, every human child is equipped with abilities to learn language the way he learns how to walk. He is neither taught how to speak nor how to walk, and all normal children begin to speak and walk at around the same age. This indisputable fact also applies to animals where, a ‘*baby*’ of some animals (giraffe, deer, donkey, etc.) can indeed walk and produce signals in a matter of *minutes after its birth*, i.e. *it is born speaking*. Given that *human and animal babies have an innate and natural capacity to develop systems by which they communicate, exactly as they have a natural capacity to see, hear, move, etc.*, and given that ‘*the capacity*’ must belong to

<sup>289</sup> Ancient Chinese k’ân “to cut”: g’ǎn “scar”; siǎn “to wash”: siǎr id.; gǐwan “round”: gǐwad “to surround”: k’jwan “circle”.



*them by nature, i.e. supposed to exist 'before birth' just like 'eyes', 'tongue', 'ears', 'hands', etc., i.e. in their mothers' wombs*<sup>290</sup>. It is only that, 'after birth', *the capacity becomes observable*. It is this *genetically determined capacity* with its natural ability to 'see' (or observe), 'think', and 'invent' that generates 'language' and not a 'god' of any sort, of any rank, of any culture.

---

<sup>290</sup> Think, for example, of a bird how it structures its nest; *it is the same nest built by the whole species*. The plan it follows can neither be due to *imitation* nor to what is called 'instinct'. It is due to a natural capacity a bird endowed with *before birth*, i.e. *before hatching from an egg*. It seems that the extent to which the brain develops *after birth* marks the major difference between *man* and *animal*.

## CHAPTER THREE

### COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INDO-EUROPEAN *And* HAMITO-SEMITIC FAMILIES OF LANGUAGES

#### 3.1 *Indo-European Family of Languages*

Most of the languages of Europe (Latin, Greek, Slavic, etc.) and of India and Iran (Sanskrit, Persian, etc.) belong to what is called the *Indo-European family* (or *Indo-Germanic*, used by German scholars). In other words, they have developed out of a single language spoken in prehistoric times, called *Primitive* (or Proto-) *Indo-European*. The term '*Indo-European*' is originally coined in reference to the geographic location of the Indo-European languages, i.e. *on the territory extending from India to Europe*. What term or terms the Indo-Europeans used to call their language and themselves, we have no way of knowing, nor do we know the exact place where it was originally spoken.

Attempts to localize the original homeland of Proto-Indo-European have been made on the basis of shared vocabulary, i.e. *terms for certain trees, some metals, animal names, climate and geographic terms*, and so forth. The existence of cognate words in the principal Indo-European languages for *trees* (oak, pine, birch, etc.), *animals* (deer, bear, wolf, etc.), *metals* (copper, etc.), and *cold, snow, honey*, coupled with the absence of cognates for *Asiatic trees, animals*, etc. may point to *Europe* as the predispersion home. Various places in Europe have been proposed- in the Baltic area, northern Europe, etc. Furthermore, the absence of a common word for '*sea*' may indicate that the home was '*inland*'. The earlier scholars, however, localized the home of the original

Indo-Europeans somewhere in India, where Sanskrit was spoken.

Apart from the fact that nearly all of the ‘*terms*’ upon which the theory is based are also Hamito-Semitic and this is by itself sufficient to bring the argument to an end, this Indoeuropeanists’ deductive method presupposes that words for some *trees*, *animals*, *metals*, etc. have retained their *meanings*. *How can we be certain of this?* Another question may arise: *Are the shared terms free from ‘borrowing’?*

The following is an outline of the major Indo-European language divisions:

**3.1.1 Hittite**, or **Anatolian**, long since extinct, was spoken in Asia Minor, or *Anādūl*, and comprised, in addition to Hittite, *Luwian*, *Lycian*, *Lydian*, and *Palaic*. Because of its great antiquity, Hittite is the most important Anatolian language, with records dating as far back as the 16<sup>th</sup> century B.C. if not earlier, the oldest records yet known of an Indo-European language. Some scholars, notably Edgar Sturtevant, believe that Hittite is a sister of Proto-Indo-European rather than a daughter, and propose a parent tongue, called *Indo-Hittite*, from which both Hittite and Indo-European languages are descended. It is much more reasonable to assume, however, *that Hittite was the earliest language division to split from ‘Common IE’*.

**3.1.2 Indo-Iranian**. This branch falls into two sub-branches: *Indic* and *Iranian*. The oldest Indic literary documents are the *Vedas*, the sacred books of India, and the earliest of such *Vedas* is the *rig-Veda*, a collection of about a thousand liturgical hymns. The *Vedas* were written in an *older form of Sanskrit*, called *Vedic*. The exact date of the documents is unknown, but it is probable that the oldest hymns go back to the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium B.C.

*Sanskrit*, described in a brilliant grammar by Pānini in the 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C., is the vehicle of a copious Indian literature including the two great epics, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyana*. To this day Sanskrit remains an important learned language for Indian scholars.

Alongside of Sanskrit there existed a large number of languages spoken in India, known as *Prākṛits*. From these *Prākṛits* have eventually descended the present Indo-European languages of India. The most important of these are *Hindi*, *Bengali*, *Punjabi*, *Urdu*, *Kashmir*, *Singhalese*, and *Nepali*.

On the Iranian side, we have two ancient languages: *Avesta*, the language of the sacred book ‘*Avesta*’ of the *Zoroastrians*, and *Old Persian*. The oldest texts of *Avesta* are the *Ghathas* (*hymns*) from probably the 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> century B.C., and those of *Old Persian* are the inscriptions of the *Achaemenid dynasty* (521-338 B.C.). All modern Iranian languages are indirectly derived from Old Persian. The principal existing languages of them are *Persian*, *Afghani*, *Beluchi*, *Ossetian*, and *Kurdish*.

**3.1.3 Greek**, or **Hellenic**, with many ancient dialects such as *Doric*, *Attic*, *Ionic*, *Aeolic*, and *Arcadic*. Its earliest written records are inscriptions preserved on clay tablets found on the isle of Crete and written in a syllabic script known as *linear B*. The inscriptions date from 1400 to 1200 B.C. and written in *Mycenian Greek*.

The earliest known Greek literary works- the *Iliad* and the *Odyssy*- date from the 8<sup>th</sup>

century B.C., when texts came to be written in the Greek alphabet. Later, a simplified variety of spoken Greek, known as *Koine* (*the common language*), established itself as the medium of communication throughout the Greek empire. All modern dialects of Greek are descendants of this *Koine*.

**3.1.4 Italic.** This branch falls into three language groups: *Oscan-Umbrian*, *Latin-Faliscan*, and *Sabellian*, which were spoken in ancient Italy. Of these languages the most important, both historically and linguistically, was *Latin*, the speech of Rome. As in the course of time the political influence of Rome came to dominate the Roman Empire, its dialect, *Latin*, gradually replaced not only all other Italic languages, but also many languages in Western and Eastern Europe. The earliest document of Latin is a short inscription from the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C. From the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C. on, documentation is continuous.

The Romance languages such as *French*, *Italian*, *Spanish*, and *Portuguese*, are all derived from *Vulgar Latin*, which was used throughout the Roman Empire.

**3.1.5 Celtic**, once spoken widely in Europe, it is now confined to the British Isles and to Brittany. This division of the Indo-European seems headed toward extinction, in some places rapidly and in some others slowly. *Gaulish*, spoken in ancient Gaul (France), became extinct in the 5<sup>th</sup> century, *Cornish* in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and *Manx*, once spoken on the Isle of man, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. *Irish* and *Welsh* are steadily losing ground to the influence of English, and *Breton* (in Brittany, northwestern France) to the influence of French. *Scottish Gaelic* is spoken by a very small number of people in Scotland, only in the rural areas of the Highlands.

**3.1.6 Germanic.** The branch is divided into three sub-branches termed *East*, *West*, and *North Germanic*. *East Germanic* languages are all extinct, and the best known of them is *Gothic*, whose texts are fragments of the Bible translation made in the 4<sup>th</sup> century A.D. by Ulfilas, the Bishop of the West Goths.

*West Germanic* includes *Anglo-Frisian* and *German*. The former falls into *English* and *Frisian*, and the latter into *High German*, *Low German* (or Saxon), and *Franconian*. The records of this sub-branch began to appear between the 7<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> centuries. The earliest records of *English* are glosses from around 700, those of *Old High German* date from the middle of the 8<sup>th</sup> century, while those of *Low German* or *Old Saxon* from the 9<sup>th</sup>.

The oldest records of *North Germanic* (or Scandinavian) are the runic inscriptions, some of which date as far back as the 3<sup>rd</sup> century A.D. The Scandinavian languages are *Swedish* and *Danish* (East Scandinavian), *Norwegian*, *Icelandic*, and *Faroese* (West Scandinavian). The term *Old Norse* is often used to refer to texts written in Scandinavian languages, esp. Old Icelandic, before the 13<sup>th</sup> century.

**3.1.7 Tocharian**, the speech of ‘Ṭayār’, was spoken in the northern part of Chinese Turkistan. It is known from texts discovered in the early part of the last century, written in two distinct dialects labeled *A* and *B*, and dating from the 6<sup>th</sup> to the 8<sup>th</sup> centuries.

**3.1.8 Balto-Slavic.** This group is subdivided into two subgroups: the *Baltic* and *Slavic* or *Slovanic*, which in spite of differences, have many features in common to justify their being grouped together. The Baltic languages are *Lithuanian*, *Latvian* (or *Lettish*), and the extinct *Old Prussian* (since 1700). The oldest written records of Lithuanian and Latvian are from the 16<sup>th</sup> century, while those of Old Prussian from the 14<sup>th</sup>.

The Slavic group falls into three subgroups termed *Western Slavic*: *Polish*, *Czech*, *Slovak*, *Eastern Slavic*: *Russian*, *Ukrainian*, *Byelorussian* (or White Russian), and *Southern Slavic*: *Bulgarian*, *Serbo-Croatian*, *Slovenian*, *Macedonian*. *Old Church Slavonic* (or old Bulgarian), whose oldest texts date from the 9<sup>th</sup> century, also belongs to the *Southern* sub-branch, and is still used as a liturgical language in the Eastern Orthodox Church. In this respect, its use is similar to that of Latin in the Roman Catholic Church.

**3.1.9 Armenian**, spoken in Armenia and (through migration) in parts of the Middle East, Europe, and America. Its oldest writings date from the 5<sup>th</sup> century.

**3.1.10 Albanian**, spoken in Albania and it constitutes, like Armenian, a distinct branch of the family. Its oldest texts date from the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Albanian is also like Armenian in that its vocabulary is so mixed with foreign elements that its native word stock is small.

In addition to the ten major language divisions of Indo-European outlined above, there are still some other Indo-European languages such as the extinct and poorly known **Illyrian**, **Thracian**, and **Phrygian**. *Illyrian* is known from a few glosses and some personal and geographical names, *Thracian* from glosses, two inscriptions, and proper names, and *Phrygian* from some short inscriptions (of the 8<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C.), proper names, and several glosses.

### 3.1.11 *Proto-Indo-European Sound System*

a) According to Brugmann (1904: §37), PIE sound system included the following phonemes:

Stops:     p   ph   b   bh  
             t   th   d   dh  
             k̂   k̂   ĝ   ĝh  
             q   qh   g   gh  
             q<sup>w</sup> q<sup>w</sup>h   g<sup>w</sup>   g<sup>w</sup>h

Fricatives: s   sh   z   zh   δ   δh

Nasals:    m   n   ñ   ŋ

Liquids:   r   l

Semivowels: y   w

Syllabic liquids and nasals: *two sets of short and long* ɾ ɻ ɱ ɳ, ɲ, ɽ

Vowels: *two sets of short and long* /i u a e o/ plus /ə/

Diphthongs: *two sets of short and long* /ai ei oi au eu ou/ plus /əi/ and /əu/<sup>291</sup>.

c) Another PIE phonological system is reconstructed by Szemerényi (1990: §4.9.1-2). The system is very similar to that proposed by Brugmann, but differs from it mainly in fricatives, which includes /s/ and laryngeal /h/.

b) According to Lehmann (1980: §§2.1a, 13.1, & 15.6), the PIE sound system included the following phonemes<sup>292</sup>:

Stops:        p   (b) bh  
              t   d   dh  
              k   g   gh  
              k<sup>w</sup> g<sup>w</sup> g<sup>w</sup>h

Fricative: s

Resonants: y   w   r   l   m   n

Vowels:    ī   e   ē   ə   a   ā   o   ō   ū

Laryngeals: x   γ   h   ’

Apart from laryngeals, comparison of this system with that proposed by Brugmann reveals that the very same PIE had changed so drastically, so radically, and beyond recognition in little less than ‘*half of a century*’ between Brugmann’s work and that of Lehmann (1<sup>st</sup> published in 1952). Moreover, the presence of a long vowel (e.g. ī, ū) in any language presupposes, as *a rule*, the presence of its short counterpart.

c) Sturtevant (IHL: §24) assumed that Proto-Indo-Hittite had the following sound system:

Stops:        p    t    k  
              b    d    g  
              bh dh gh

Fricative: s

Laryngeals: /ʔ/, /ɣ/, /x/, /γ/

Vowels: e, ē, o, ō, ə

Semivowels: y, w, l, r, m, n.

### 3.1.12 *The Laryngeal Theory*

The laryngeal theory rests on the assumption that the Proto-Indo-European phonological system included a number of consonant phonemes, known as laryngeals, whose precise phonetic values are still unknown. Such laryngeals were lost in nearly all IE languages without direct reflexes. Among other things, the theory also attempts to account for many of the long vowels in IE.

---

<sup>291</sup> A system with all such huge numbers of vowels and diphthongs may require, theoretically speaking, 3 or 4 consonants only, and not such equally huge numbers of consonants.

<sup>292</sup> Lehmann considers that the above system- *plus three suprasegmental phonemes*- is also valid for pre-IE.

The first scholar to assume the previous existence of lost phonemes in IE was Ferdinand de Saussure, who deduced in 1878 from the analysis of IE ablaut classes that PIE had certain sound patterns which were lost in its dialects, but which, before being lost, left their effects on neighboring sounds. He postulated two sounds /A/ and /Ô/, calling them ‘*coefficients sonantiques*’, or simply ‘*sonants*’, and attributed the length of the so-called ‘*original IE vowels*’ and ‘*resonants*’ to compensatory lengthening upon the loss of a following *sonant*. Accordingly, the loss of PIE \*/A/ in \*steA- “stand” gives rise to /ā/ in Grk ἰστᾶμι.

In a paper read in 1891 Saussure presented another revolutionary proposal. He analyzed the Indo-Iranian voiceless aspirates /ph, th, kh/ as sequences of plain voiceless stops /p, t, k/ plus a following *sonant*. Thus Skt. pr̥thus “wide, large”, for example, is from PIE \*p̥ltAs-. Saussure’s hypothesis of lost consonants, which did not occur in any of the IE languages then known, was not recognized until 1927 when Kurylowicz demonstrated that Hittite /h/ appeared in many of the places already specified by Saussure as reflexes of earlier *sonants*.

The term ‘*laryngeal*’ (a translation of the Arabic term ‘*ḥalḳiyyah*’ for *laryngeal sounds*) was introduced by Herman Möller, who first proposed an additional laryngeal /E/ to /A/ and /Ô/ that Saussure had postulated, but later, as he attempted to connect IE and Semitic in one linguistic family, he identified the lost IE laryngeals phonetically and historically with those of Semitic.

With confirmation from Hittite in which a laryngeal, symbolized with /h/, is found in many basic IE roots<sup>293</sup>, the laryngeal theory is generally accepted today, though in widely differing forms, by almost all Indoeuropeanists. The most basic assumptions of the theory may be summarized as follows:

1) PIE had a number of laryngeals; most scholars posit either *three* (Benseviste 1935, Cowgill 1960, Beekes 1969, Kieler 1970, Burrow 1973) or *four* (Kurylowicz 1935, Sapir 1938, Kerns-Schwartz 1940, Sturtevant, IHL: §24, Lehman, 1980: §15.6, Bomhard 1981).

2) PIE had no initial vowels. Thus following Sturtevant (IHL: §53) «*We shall assume an initial laryngeal whenever our reconstructed IE shows an initial vowel*». The same assumption is held by other Indoeuropeanists (Kurylowicz 1935: 29, Bomhard 1980).

3) PIE *voiceless aspirates* /ph, th, kh/ developed from voiceless non-aspirates /p, t, k/ plus laryngeal (Kurylowicz 1935: 38, Sturtevant, IHL: §78, Lehmann 1980: §3.6D, Burrow 1973: 87).

4) The so-called ‘*original long IE vowels*’ developed from short vowels lengthened upon loss of laryngeals (Kurylowicz 1935: 28, Benveniste 1935: 149, Sturtevant IHL: §67, Lehmann 1952: §3.6B, Burrow 1973: 87, Bomhard 1980: 125).

5) The so-called ‘*long syllabic resonants*’ developed from a short resonant plus laryngeal (Sturtevant IHL: §69, Lehmann 1980: §8.1ff, Burrow 1973: 86).

Hittite evidence proved the correctness of the laryngeal theory and solved some old problems, but, at same time, created many new problems. In fact, the evidence is

<sup>293</sup> Hitt. ḫant- “before, in front”: Skt. anti “before, opposite”, Lat. ante “before”, Grk anti “opposite”; Hitt. paḫḫur “fire”, Grk πῦρ, OE. fȳr, Umbr. pir id.; Hitt. ḫa-aš-ta-i “bone”, Skt. asthi-, Av. ast-, Lat. os id., etc.

incomplete and in many respects contradictory. Hittite has *one laryngeal* written /h/ or /hh/. The writing of single or double /h/ depends on the adjoining sounds: /-hh-/ appears medially between vowels and /h/ initially and also between a vowel and a consonant (HCG: §74). Thus Hittite does not have *the three or four laryngeals* demanded by the theory. Besides, this laryngeal does not always appear in Hittite words where it should be, as demanded by the theory. For example, many of the Hittite words do not begin with /h/ when their IE cognates show initial vowels: cf. Hitt. *et* “to eat” = Skt. *ad-*, Lat. *edere*; Hitt. *aku-* “to drink”, Lat. *aqua* “to drink”, Goth. *ahwa* “river”. Similarly, Hittite /h/ does not appear in Hitt. *dai-* “to put” = Skt. *dhā-*, Av. *dā-* id.; Hitt. *tai-* “to take” = Skt. *dā-* “to give”, Lat. *dare*; Hitt. *ti-it-ta-mi* “to place” = Skt. *sthā-* id., lat. *stāre*; Hitt. *dalugaēs* “long” = Skt. *ḍīrgha-* id., and so forth. Another inherited weakness of the theory is that while the voiceless aspirates are considered as consisting of *voiceless stop* + *laryngeal*, their voiced counterparts are for the most part treated as simply voiced aspirated stops.

Some Indoeuropeanists sought to strengthen the theory by investigating reflexes of laryngeals in various IE language divisions. However, the evidence drawn from such studies show conflicting views on the reflexes of laryngeals, on the criteria and techniques used to determine reflexes, and as a result on the number of proposed laryngeals (Winter, 1965, Lehmann, 1980: §§4, 9, 10, Szemerényi, 1999: 121-145).

Our final conclusion is that evidence from Hittite is insufficient to serve as a proof of the theory *actually existing* unless we recognize *three* facts, of which the first has long been recognized, but *is insufficient by itself*:

a) Hittite /h/ represents a number of lost laryngeals. In this respect, its laryngeal is similar to Akkadian /h/, which has a number of different origins, e.g. Akk. *šhr* “small” (< *šyr*) = CA, Ug., OSA *šyr* id., and Akk. *hkm* “to understand” (< *hkm*) = CA, Ug. *hkm* “wise”, while Akk. *hnk* = CA *hnk*, Phoen., Heb. *hnk* “to strangle”.

b) the effect of semivowels /w/ and /y/ on neighboring sounds mirrors that of laryngeals. Any loss or modification of either /w/ or /y/, esp. *in medial or final position* leaves a visible effect on the neighboring sound which is *indistinguishable from that caused by the loss of a laryngeal*. Hamito-Semitic languages furnish ample evidence clarifying this fact. For example, CA *mīzānu* [wzn] is from \**miwzānu*. The loss of a semivowel caused the preceding vowel to lengthen. Another example is CA *ḥafā* “he hid, concealed”, supposed to be pronounced *ḥafaya* as in *ḥafay-nā* “we hid”; *ḥafay-tum* “you pl. hid”, etc. The loss of /-y-/ lengthens the preceding vowel in the same way as does the loss of /-ʾ/ in Akk. *malū* “to fill” = CA *mala’a* id. and the loss of /-h-/ in Akk. *nāru* “river” = CA *nahru* id.

c) In addition, *long vowels may also result from the reduction of diphthongs*: see my *Comments* on Hamito-Semitic diphthongs in §§1.1.5, esp. ft <sup>1</sup> & 1.1.6 above.

**3.1.13** What follows is a detailed comparative study of IE and HS families of languages. *It will demonstrate in a way as clear as sunshine* that both language families exhibit strong affinity in their vocabularies and in their grammars; *they share in common the same words* (e.g. *nouns, verbs, adjectives, prepositions, interrogatives, demonstratives, personal pronouns, numbers, etc.*). Their differences in sounds are lesser than those



existing between any two Indo-European language divisions or any two Hamito-Semitic language divisions, and such difference can be accounted for in terms of phonological rules.

The study will also show that both families share in common similar grammatical systems, i.e.

- a) *the very same derivational affixes,*
- b) *the same methods of word formation,*
- b) A least, a half of the *essential HS verb stems with all of their grammatical affixes,* discussed in §2.1.7.3 above, *are present in IE.*

A deep investigation of ‘*inflections*’ in both families reveals that all inflections that had been common to both before they broke off from their common source *have been preserved intact*. In this respect, there are also *no differences*.

No attempts will be given below to trace every IE-HS word to its ultimate origin because this hard task has already been made in Chapter II for Hamito-Semitic words.

The traditionally reconstructed PIE roots will be accepted as they are, but it will be shown clearly that what the Indoeuropeanists have been accustomed to call ‘*roots*’ are no more than *complex* and *compound words*. All such words are also Hamito-Semitic in all linguistic details; this provides another weighty reason why I will often refrain from reconstructing their underlying proots.

As has been just mentioned, Indo-European and Hamito-Semitic have in common the very same complex and compound words, together with their underlying proots, a fact clearly entails that they also share the very same basic methods of word formation employed to create such words; the difference between them in this respect is in *productivity*, i.e. *a method may be productive in IE, but less productive in HS, or vice-versa*.

As one may not expect, my present comparative study of both families will be carried out independently of all linguistic findings in chapter II, simply because all Chapter III, except section §3.18, was written many years before my work on chapter II. The few references made to data in chapter II are later additions to this chapter.

A close examination of Indo-European cognate forms reveals many interesting linguistic phenomena. Some of such phenomena have not been detected by Indoeuropeanists; some others have been misunderstood and wrongly explained. Every phenomenon will be accounted for in the course of this chapter whenever the optimal time permits and often under *Comments*.

Three terms will be used in our reconstruction of Proto-IE-HS vocabulary:

- a) *Proot* (rarely used) = primeval morpheme or proot,
- b) *Stem* = a compound of two proots,
- c) *Word* = a complex word consisting of more than two morphemes.

### 3.2 *PROTO-IE-HS /q/*

Proto-IE-HS /q/ is a voiceless uvular stop . It is in PIE /*ḱ*/, based on Skt. /*ć*/ and/or Grm. /h/, and in PHS /*q̣*/.

**3.2.1** Proto-IE-HS stem [qub-] in various formations meaning “bowl, head, hump”, etc. Grm. /h-/ below makes it clear that the PIE initial consonant was definitely /*ḱ*-/ and not /*k*-/.

IE: Skt. kub-jah “humped”, Grk kúbē “head”, Goth. hups “hip”, OE. hype, OHG. huf id.: ON. hoppa “to dance”, OE. hoppian “to hop”. IECD, 579; SS: §10.43; WP I, 373.

HS: Egyp. *ḳb-t* “the arch of the sky, vault of heaven”, CA *ḳubba-tu* fem. “dome; humpy”: *ḳabbaba* “make convex, to vault”, Phoen. *ḳbh* “vaulted room” (NWSI II, 978), Heb. *ḳab* “a hollow or concave vessel”; *ḳubbah* “a tent, high and round like a dome, vaulted pleasure-tent”, Syr. *ḳbb* id., BAram. *ḳbb* “to vault, arch” (OT, 908).

For the Grk word above: CA *ḳabbu* “head, master”.

For the Grm. words: CA *ḳabbu* also “part between the two hips”; *ḳababu* “emaciated or thin waist”.

#### *Comments*

Grm. words above are connected with Lat. cubitum “elbow” (SS: §10.43). For the Lat. word, see §3.3.35 below.

**3.2.2** Proto-IE-HS stem [qē’qē’-] “darkness, blindness”. In IE the form has a diphthong \*/ai/ in the base and this diphthong is certainly the orig. root vowel.

IE: Goth. haihs “one-eyed”, OIr. caech id., W. coeg-ddall “half-blind”, Lat. caecus “blind”. CCG: §14; IECD, 459; WP. I, 328.

HS: Egyp. *ḳ’ḳ’*, *ḳḳ* ~ *k’k’* “darkness, night, obscurity”, Cush.: Ag., Bil., Qu. ki “to spend the night”, Ch. *či*, Sid. gi id. (VPHS, 113), Assy. kukku “darkness” (King, 1898: 351), CA *ḳaḳa-tu* “domestic crow”, so-called because of its *dark* color, *ḳaḳa-tu* “wrong or misleading opinion”.

Important related words in IE & HS families are:

3.2.2a PIE \**kakka*- “excrement”, *orig. nursery word exactly as in CA below*: Grk *kakkáō* “void excrement”, Lat. *cacāre*, Ir. *cacaim*, etc. (SS: §4.66; IECD, 461; WP. I, 336) = CA *ḳaḳa*, said only of a baby, id.; *ḳiḳa-tu* “excrement (of a baby *only*). A baby also says *ḳaḳa* when he sees *excrement* or *s.t. foul*.

3.2.2b Other related words are Egyp. *ḳ’* “to vomit”, *ḳ’s* id., gen. Sem. *ḳā’a*, as a n. *ḳai’* = Skt. *kās*- “to cough”, ON *hōsta*, etc. see §3.2.70 below.

**3.2.3** Proto-IE-HS proot [quw-] “to attack”

IE: Lith. *kova* “battle”, *kauti* “to strike”, Latv. *kaut* “to strike, fight”, OE. *hēawan* “to strike”, etc. SS: §20.11.

HS: Egyp. *ḳw* “to attack”, etc. see §3.2.61 below.

### 3.2.4 Proto-IE-HS word [qāqu-(l)] “kind of tree”

IE: Grk. *kókkos* “seed-capsule, berry, kernel”, *kókkōn* “pomegranate seed”, *kókalon* “pine-kernel”, LLat. *coculus* “winter cherry”, Skt. *kakkolah* “a berry-bearing tree”, OE. *haga* and common Grm. “haw, rosehip”, Arm. *kokov* “testicle”, Ir. *cocan* “bud, calyx”, Bulg. *koko* “berry, nut, egg”. IECD, 523f.

HS: Egyp. *k’k* “a plant with a bitter taste”, Heb. *ḳīḳāyōn* “a kind of plant” (OT, 925), CA *ḳāḳullā* “a kind of plant”. It also belongs here CA *ḳi’ḳi* “eggshell”; *ḳuwaiḳatu* dim. “egg”.

It is most likely that the ‘tree’ in question had fruit resembling ‘bird’s eggs’, and that this shape has given rise in the course of time to such notions as ‘egg’, ‘testicle’, and so forth.

### 3.2.5 Proto-IE-HS stem [qau-q] “hunger”

IE: Goth. and common Germ. *huhrus* “hunger”. SS: §5.14.

HS: Cush.: Ga. *koka* “hunger”, Har. *ḳūḳ bāya* “feel very hungry” (HED, 127), CA *ḳawā* “hunger”.

### 3.2.6 Proto-IE-HS stem [qad-] “to split”

IE: Grk *kedázō* “to split”, Oss. *sādtīn* “to break”, etc. IECD, 605f.

HS: CA *ḳadda* “to split, cleave, tear, pierce”; CA *ḳaddūmu* “ax” = Heb. *ḳardōm* (fr. \**ḳaddōm*, the first -d- dissimilating to -r-), Har. *ḳādāda* “to cut through, tear”, Tna., *ḳādādā*, Te. *ḳāddā*, Amh., Arg. *ḳāddādā* “to tear”, S, W. *ḳādādā*, etc. (HED, 122).

### 3.2.7 Proto-IE-HS stem [qad-] “manner, virtue”

IE: Grk *kedós* “good, worth”, Hom. *kednā* “true, favorable”, Lat. *cedere* “to tell, show, give”, Av. *sad-* “to reward, bestow”. IECD, 606.

HS: Egyp. *ḳd* “kind, manner”, *ḳdd* “character, quality, virtue”, CA *ḳida-tu*, *ḳidwa-tu* fem. “good example to follow”, with m-ext.: CA *mu-ḳaddamu* “chief”, *ḳadmu* “glory”; *ḳaddama* “to present, give”, OffAram., Nab. *ḳdm* “to present oneself, be brought, to precede; chief” (NWSI I, 987), OAram. *ḳdm* “before” (AG, 6), Phoen. *ḳdm* “be in front, firstling” (PG, 143), Sab. *ḳdm* “leader, commander” (SD, 103-104), Har. *ḳādāma* “precede, advance”, Ge., Tna., Amh. *ḳāddāmā* id., M., Ms. *ḳādam-* “first”, etc. (HED, 122), Som. *kadi* “to withhold customary gift”.

For Hom. *kēdnā* above: CA *ḳadamu* “true, favorable” plus “having a sublime status”.

### 3.2.8 Proto-IE-HS stem [qaq-] “to dance”

IE: OCS. and common Sl. *skočiti* “to dance, jump”, Lith. *šokti* id., OE. *scacan* “to shake”, ON. *skaka* id. IECD, 1154f; SS: §10.43; IEV, 262. For initial /s-/, see §3.3.28, under *Comments* below.

HS: Egyp. *kks* “to dance” (ksks also “to dance”, Berb.: Kab. *keškeš* id.), CA *ta-ḳauḳsa* “to canter or gallop” (LA).

### 3.2.9 Proto-IE-HS word [qulp ~ qilp] “a cover”, as a vb [qalap-]

IE: Grk kalúptō “to cover”, Skt. éarman- “protection, shelter”: éarīri- “body”, Ir. celim “to hide”. SS: §4.11.

HS: Akk. ḫulpu “bark”, CA ḫulāfa-tu, ḫilfu “crust, bark” also “foreskin”, ḫalīfu “large bag” ~ ḫirfu “bark, crust”, ḫarfu “hide”, Eth. ḫerfat id., Syr. ḫlāptā “bark” (Rabin, 1975: 87, n. 3).

### 3.2.10 Proto-IE-HS stem [qēḥ] “to cut stone, strike”

IE: OE. hæccan “to cut, hack”, connected by Lehmann (PIEP: §5.4d) with OE. hēawan “to cut, hew”, OHG. houwan id.: Lat. cūdō “to cut, strike”, Lith. kauti “to strike”, OCS. kovati “to hammer”. He reconstructs PIE \*keX-w-. To this root also belong Toch. A ko-, B kau “to kill”, Latv. kaut, etc. “to strike, fight”.

HS: Eygp. ḫḥḫḥ, by redupl., “to cut stone, to carve, to engrave” also “to hammer out”, fr. ḫḥ “to cut stones”. The CA cognate is most likely ḫaḥzana “to strike, kill”, prob. with ‘a cudgel’, since ḫaḥzana-tu fem. = “cudgel, stick, a kind of wood”, a compound of \*ḫaḥ- “to strike, kill” and \*-zan: CA zān “beech wood”, specifying the *instrument* used in *striking* or *killing*.

The above analysis suggests that the following IE-HS words are from [qēḥ]:

IE: Lat. cōs “whetstone”, OE. hān “stone”, ON. hein “whetstone”: Skt. cā-, cī- “sharpen” (SS: §1.50; WP. I. 454).

HS: Egyp. ḫḥ “flint, a kind of stone”.

### 3.2.11 Proto-IE-HS stem [qal-] “to abuse”, as a subs. [qul- or qil-]

IE: OCor. collet “loss, damage”, W. coll, Br. koll id., Ir. coll id., collim “to destroy, ruin”, Goth. halts “lame”, OE. healt id. CCG: §45; SS: §11.27.

HS: Assy. ḫalalu “to abuse”; ḫillatu “transgression, offence” (King, 1898: 381), Heb. ḫll “to abuse, revile, be diminished”, ḫllḫl, Eth. ḫllḫl “to shake” (OT, 927-928), Mand. ḫll “shame, ignominy” (MD, 408), CA ḫalla “to grow less”; ḫalḫala “to shake violently”.

With suffixed /-t/ as in Grm.: CA ḫalita “to perish, damage”; ḫalatu “death”.

For Grm. words above: CA kaliṭu (fr. \*ḫalitu) “lame”, in SL ’altā fem. (i.e. ḫaltā) “short and lame”, Mand. ḫalaṭia “short”, in JAram. “to contract” (MD, 400).

### 3.2.12 Proto-IE-HS stem [qal-] “to rise”

IE: Skt. éal- “spring up, rise”, Arm. slanam “soar”. IECD, Suppl. 1665.

HS: CA ḫalla “to rise”, etc. see §3.2.13 below.

### 3.2.13 Proto-IE-HS stem [qul-] “top, summit; mountain”

IE: Lat. -collere “to rise”; celsus “high, tall”; collis “mountain”, Toch. A sul, B. sal id., OE. hyll “hill”, OS. holm, ON. hallr id., OW. celi “heaven”, OCS, čelo “forehead”: PIE \*kel-. IECD, 486; SS: §1.22; WP. I, 490f.

HS: CA ḫalla, CX ’istaḫalla “to raise, rise”; ḫulla-tu fem. “top of a mountain” also “head”, ḫulā also “top of a mountain”, Berb.: Kab. akərru (y) “head”, So. akəllal id., Cush.: Ag., Bil. aḡuar id., Har. ḫala “upper story”, etc. see §2.2.25 above.

### 3.2.14 Proto-IE-HS stem [qul-] “collar”

IE: Lat. collum “neck”, Goth. and common Germ. hals id. SS: §4.28; WP. I, 434.

HS: Egyp. ḳʿll “collar”, Copt. klal id., Som. kula “necklace”, Har. ḳullān “nape of the neck”, Ga. ḳolei, Sid. ḳōle, etc. (HED, 124).

With d- or t-ext: CA ḳilād-tu “necklace, collar”, fr. \*ḳullā-tu; its final fem. suffix \*-tu became a part of the root and gave rise to two trilaterals [ḳld] above and [ḳlt] “between the neck and the two small rising bones of the upper shoulders (the area where *necklace* is put)”.

### 3.2.15 Proto-IE-HS word [qul'-] “stone”, in CA ḳala'a “to rise” < ḳalla “to raise, rise” (§3.2.12 above).

IE: Goth. hallus “rock”, OE. heall “rock, boulder”, ON. hallr “large stone”, Arm. sal “flint”, W. calen “wet-stone”. IECD, 615.

HS: CA ḳulla'a-tu “rock, stone”; ḳala'a “to sling (with stone), Ug. ḳl' “sling” (UG, 536), Phoen. ḳl' “slinger” (PG, 143), Ga. kuli “a kind of stone”, Som. ḳororoḥ, pl., “stone”.

Some related words are:

3.2.15a IE: Skt. éālā- “house”; éalam- “at home”, Grk kaliā “hut, den, cell”.

HS: CA ḳal'a-tu “stronghold, fortress”, Syr. ḳl' “stronghold”, but Som. akal “house”, fr. 'ḳl: cf. CA, Sab, etc. 'ḳl also “stronghold, fortress”.

### 3.2.16 Proto-IE-HS word [qalap- or laqap-] “to steal, take”, the 1<sup>st</sup> form is seen in IE and the 2<sup>nd</sup> in CA.

IE: Lat. clepō “I steal”, Grk kléptō, Goth. hlifan “to steal”, OCS. za-clenoti “to hide”, Oss. kārāf “greed; greedy”. IECD, 510; WP. I, 497.

HS: CA laḳafa “to snatch away, take with the hand or tongue”. This word belongs to a group of trilaterals expressing “snatch away, carry off, take”: see §2.1.9.2, n. b above.

Some related words are:

3.2.16a OE. hlēotan “to acquire by lot”, ON. hljota “to get, befall”, reflex. “to happen” = CA laḳiya “to find, meet”; ta-laḳḳa “to receive, get”. Note that \*/lḳd and lḳt/ are not permitted, while laḳaṯa “to take s.t. you find on the ground with the hand”; 'iltiḳāṯ-an “by chance”, laḳaṯa “to take fast”.

3.2.16b See §3.2.9 above.

### 3.2.17 Proto-IE-HS word [qaml-] “worm”, fr. an earlier [qam-] as in CA ḳamḳamu “louse”.

IE: Skt. ḳṛm- “worm”, Lith. kirmėlė id.

HS: Akk. kalmatu (from \*ḳamlatu) “worm”, CA ḳamlatu, Heb. ḳinnām “louse”, Syr. ḳālmata, Eth. ḳwēmāl (Rabin, 1975: 88), OArām. ḳml “louse” (NWSI II, 1013), Sab. ḳlm “insect pest” (SD, 105).

**3.2.18** Proto-IE-HS stem [qam-] “crooked or bent object”, ult. fr. [qau-] as in CA *qāma-tu* “pulley with all its wooden parts”, mi-*q̄wamu* inst. “(arc-shaped) handle of a plough”.

IE: Skt. *ćamyā* “yoke-peg”, Grk *kámax* “stake, pole, shaft”, Lat. *camus*, *camur* “with bent horn, crooked”, MHG. *ham(e)* “fishing-rod”. IECD, 600.

HS: Egyp. *ḫm*’ “to overturn”, perh. CA mi-*q̄maʿ* *atu* inst. “crooked stick”.

Derivatives of IE-HS [qam-] are:

3.2.18a IE: Grk *kamára* “vault, chamber”, Goth and common Germ. *himins* “sky”, Hitt. *kamaras* “smoke, vapor”.

HS: CA *qamaru* “the moon”, fr. its *circular shape*: cf. Eth. *qamar* “circle” (Rabin, 1975, n. 55), with an infixed -t-: CA *qimtaru* “with crooked leg”: *qamtara* “to crook the tail (a scorpion)”.

For Hitt. *kamaras* above: CA *qamira* “to burn”, *qamaru* signifies, according to Ibn Sīdīhi (LA) “something like burning”, SL mu-ʿ*ammar* adj. (ʿ is from *q̄*), said of a loaf, of meat, etc. “well done, i.e. *burned*”.

**3.2.19** Proto-IE-HS word [qamʿ-] “protect (i.e. *restrain, hinder*, etc.)”, orig. “protecting one’s land”

IE: Lith. *kamuoti* “to oppress, press”, ON. *hemja* “to restrain”, MHG. *hamen* id., Dan. *heme* “to hinder, restrain”: OE., OFris. *ham* “meadow, pasture”: PIE \**ḱem-*. SS: §19.60; IECD, 466f; WP. I, 388f.

HS: CA *qamaʿa* “to restrain, hinder, subdue, press, oppress”, Sab. *ḫmʿ* “to vanquish” (SD, 105): Egyp. *ḫm*’ “meadow, garden”.

Words below are related to [qamʿ-]

3.2.19a IE: OE. *hem* “edge of cloth, border”, Ir. *cimas* “edge”.

HS: CA *qamʿa-tu* “edge, tip, rim, top”, *qamīʿa-tu* “edge of tail”.

**3.2.20** Proto-IE-HS stem [qam-] “to work”.

IE: Skt. *ćam-* “to work, toil”, Grk *kámnō* id., Lith. *kamuoti* “to bother, weary”: PIE \**ḱam-*, \**ḱem-*. IECD, 600; WP. I, 387f.

HS: Egyp. *ḫm*’ “to work in metal, to make”; *ḫmʿ-t* “natural disposition”, CA *qaminu* ~ *qamiyu* “capable, worthy of”.

**3.2.21** Proto-IE-HS stem [qam-], with infixed /-r-/, “to wrinkle, shrink”, developing from a word *qappa-* by dissim.<sup>294</sup>, hence [qapp-] > *ḱamp-* > *ḱramp-* (in IE) > *q̄ramm-* (in HS).

IE: OE. *ge-hrumpen* “to wrinkle”, OHG. *hrimfan* id.

HS: CA *ʿi-q̄rammaṭa* “to wrinkle, shrink”, Heb. *q̄imeṭ* id.

**3.2.22** Proto-IE-HS stem [qan-] “to vanquish, kill”: see §3.2.27 below.

IE: Grk *kainō*, fut. *kanō* “to kill”, Av. *san-* “to destroy”. IECD, 560.

---

<sup>294</sup> CA *qaffa* “to shrink (or contract) and tremble, usu. from *cold*”.

HS: Egyp. *ḳn* “to strike, vanquish”.

**3.2.23** Proto-IE-HS stem [qan-] “suffering”, related to [qan-] above.

IE: Lith. *kenčiu, kesti* “to suffer”; *kantrus* “suffering”, Latv. *ciešana* id., OIr. *cēssaim* (\**kēnts*) “to suffer”; *cēssad* “suffering”, IECD, 488; CCG: §71; SS: §16.31; WP. I, 513.

HS: Egyp. *ḳn* “to suffer injury or calamity”; *ḳnw* “injury, calamity, misfortune, violence”, CA *ḳaniṭa* “be desperate, lose all hopes” ~ *ḳanita* “be humiliated, subjugated”.

**3.2.24** Proto-IE-HS stem [qan-] “a color”

IE: OCS. *sinī* “blue”, Russ. *sinij* id., Alb. *thinjë* “grey-haired”, etc. IECD, 618.

HS: Egyp. *ḳny* “colored earth, a kind of ochre”, Phoen., Pun. *’ḳn*, from *ḳny*, “blue/purple” (NWSI I, 100), CA *ḳāni’u* “red”; *mu-ḳānātu* “mixing colors”, Syr. *ḳān* “red”, Har. *ḳanḥur* “a kind of red ant” (HED, 127).

Mann (IECD, 618) connects the IE words above with Lat. *cinis* “ashes, ember” = Egyp. *ḳnw* “fire”. For the semantic relationship between “color” and “ashes”, CA *ramādī* “grey” is fr. *ramādu* “ashes”.

**3.2.25** Proto-IE-HS stem [qa(n)d] “head”

IE: OIr. *cend, cen* “head”, Gaul. *pennos*, W. *pen*, Br. *pennid.*, Grk *kóndu* “drinking horn”, Lith. *kanduolas* “kernel”. IECD, 529; WP. I, 390.

HS: Assy. *ḳaḳḳadu*, Ug. *ḳdḳd* “head”, with infixed /-n-/ as in IE languages: CA *ḳandu* “head”, seen in a number of self-explaining compounds (see §2.17.10 above). Besides, CA *ḳinda’w* “big head”, *ḳandalu* id., with loss of final /-d/: PChad. \**ḳ(n)-* “head” (Carnochan, 1975: 464, n. 47), Bed. *ḳino, ḳine* “head” (Müller, 1975: 64, n. 7).

**3.2.26** Proto-IE-HS stem [qan-] “bone”

IE: Grk *knēmē* “leg between knee and ankle”, OIr. *cnāim* “bone”, OE. *hamm* “hollow of the knee”, OHG. *hamma* id. SS: §4.16; WP. I, 460.

HS: Egyp. *ḳny* “bone”, CA *ḳanā* “curve at the middle of the nose bone; aquiline”, Phoen. *ḳn* “stalk” (PG, 143), Har. *ḳānāwa* “tail” (HED, 127).

**3.2.27** Proto-IE-HS stem [qan-] “to strike, kill, vanquish” (§3.2.22 above).

IE: Grk *kentēō* “to pierce”, Skt. *śnath-* “to strike, kill”: *śícana-* “organ of generation” (SL, 291).

HS: Egyp. *ḳn, ḳnī, ḳnḳn* “to strike, beat”; *ḳny-t* “wounded, beaten”; *ḳnny* “reed”, CA *ḳanā-tu* “spear”, Akk. *ḳanū* “arrow, reed” (AG, 96).

**3.2.28** Proto-IE-HS stem [qin-] “hencoop”, [qan-] “cock, hen”

IE: Goth., OE. *hana* “cock”, OHG. *hano*, ON. *hani* id., OE. *henn* “hen”, OHG. *henna* “hen”.

HS: CA *ḳunnu*, dial. *ḳinn* “hencoop”, Assy. *ḳinnu* “nest”.

**3.2.29** Proto-IE-HS stem [qap-] “shoulder”

IE. Skt. *śrupti*- “shoulder”, Av. *srupti*- id., Alb. *supë* id. IEV, 109.

HS: Egyp. *ḳb-t* “shoulder”, from \**ḳp-t* (note that a root beginning with /*ḳ*/ followed by /*p*/ is quite rare), CA *ḳafā* “back of the neck”, Har. *ḳafāt*, S, W., Z *ḳāfāt* “forehead” (HED, 122):

With n-ext.: CA *ḳafanu* “back of the head”, Beb. *eḳəf* “head”, Chad.: Jegu *kofo* “back of the head” (Müller, 1975: 64, n. 8) = W. *cefn* “back”.

### *Comments*

It is important to note two facts:

(a) all IE-HS words above are ult. related,

(b) the exact HS cognate is /*ktf*/, with infixes rather than suffixed /*t*/: see my analysis of this word in §2.8.9 above.

### **3.2.30** Proto-IE-HS stem [*qip*] “bar, post, penis”

IE: Skt. *śepa*- “penis”, Lat. *cippus* “stake, post, mound”, Corn. *kef* “log, trunk”, Br. *kef* “trunk of tree”, MHG. *hispe* “clasp”. IECD, 503; SS: §4.492.

HS: CA *ḳafā’u* “head of penis”; *ḳuf’u* “tail”, Egyp. *ḳf’-t* “bar, wooden bolt” = CA *ḳaf’u* “wooden testudo”.

### **3.2.31** Proto-IE-HS stem [*qup-*] “basket”

IE: Grk *kápsa* “box, chest”, Lat. *capsus* “stall, pen, coach-box”, Arm. *kapank* “enclosure, trap”, OE. *hæpse* “hasp, clasp”, ON. *hespa* “hasp”, etc. IECD, 473.

HS: CA *ḳafaṣu* “cage, chest”: *ḳafaṣa* “to gather, collect” as well as “to entwine, entangle”, Heb., Aram., OSA *ḳpš* “box, cage”.

Greek and Lat. words above are loan from Semitic, and so is Grk *kophinos* “basket” (> Lat. *cophinus*): cf. Akk. *ḳuppum*, CA *ḳuffun*, etc. “basket”.

Some Indoeuropeanists connect W. *coff* obsol. “belly”, Br. *kof* id. with Grk *kophinos*. The Celtic words may be from the IE-HS word in Egyp. *ḳb-t* “bowels, intestines”, CA *ḳibba-tu* fem. “stomach”, Heb. *ḳebāh* “stomach of ruminating animals”, Amh. *ḳafat* id., etc. (VPHS, 125), also CA *ḳafsā’u* “belly”.

### **3.2.32** Proto-IE-HS stem [*qar-*], seen with many exts in words for “shout, cry out”.

IE: with m-ext.: OE. *hryman* “to shout, cry out”, ON. *hraumi* “noisy fellow”;

With g-ext.: Grk *krougázō* “to shout, cry out”;

With -ō-: Grk *krōzō* “caw, croak”, OE. *hrōc*, ON. *hroker* “rook”;

With b-ext.: Goth. *hrōpjan*, OE. *hrōpan* “to cry out, shout”;

With k-ext.: OCS. *krukû* “raven”, etc. IECD, 541f, 555; Meillet, Introd. 146; SS: §18.13.

HS: Ug. *ḳr’* “to call, noise” (UG, 531, 535), Phoen., Pun. *ḳr’* “to call” (PG, 144), OAram. *ḳr’* id. (AG, 6), Heb. *ḳārā’* “to cry out, call, read aloud” (OT, 937-939), CA *ḳara’a* “to read aloud”, Berb. *gər* “to cry out, call” (VPHS, 126, n. 235), Egyp. *k’rw-* “a call, outcry”, Chad.: Housa *ḳārā* “to cry out” (HSED, n. 1555).

Additional related words are:



3.2.32a IE: Skt. *krućati* “shouts”, Goth. *hruk* “crowing”, etc.

HS: CA *ḡarḡa* “to crackle, make a noise”, *ḡarḡara* “to coo, crackle, cry out, roar”, Heb. *ḡirḡēr* “to crackle, giggle, coo, cry out”.

3.2.32b IE: OCS. and common Sl. *kurŭ* “cock”: OCS. *kure* “chicken”.

HS: CA *ḡarru* “chicken”, Syr. *ḡaruwa* “cock”.

### 3.2.33 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḡar-] “horn, hump”.

Burrow (SL, 86) reconstructs PIE *\*ḡrHes-*. The reconstructed word corresponds to CA *ḡir*’ausu or *ḡir*’aušu “a camel with two humps”. This is in turn based on *\*ḡara-* “head” (CA *’a-ḡra*’u “bald-headed”, Heb. *ḡarāḡ* “bald-headed”, BAram *ḡrḡ* id. (OT, 942), CA *ḡari*’u “first ranker, master, head of”, orig. “head”. All are fr. a stem [ḡar] “horn, top” as in Eyp. *kr-ti*, dual, “horn”, Har., M., Go., A., S., *qār*, Te. *qar* id., etc. HED, 128, Cush.: Kaffa *karoo*, Mocha *karo* “horn” (HSED, n. 1549).

Skt. *khalati-*, Av. *kaurva-* “bald” may be cognate with the Sem. word for “bald” above. On the other hand, Skt. *ati-kulva* “entirely bald”, Lat. *calvus* “bald”, prob. = CA *kala*’u “a disease that causes hair to drop”, prob. Ga. *kulla* “bare, naked”.

IE: Skt. *ćiras-* “head”, *ćrṅga-* “horn”, a compound of *\*ćrṅ-* “horn” and *\*-ga-* “ox”, a variant of *go-* “ox” (§3.3.50 below). Accordingly, the orig. meaning of the Skt. word is “horn of an ox”. Grk *kéras* “horn”: *karā* “head”, Lat. *cornū* “horn”, Goth. and common Germ. *haurn* id., Ir., W., Br., Cor. *corn* id. IECD, 611; Meillet, *Introd.* 365; WP. I, 403ff; SS: §4.17; CCG: §77.2.

HS: Akk., CA *ḡarnu* “horn”, Ug. *ḡrn*, Heb. *ḡeren*, Eth. *ḡarn*, Syr. *ḡarnā*, Palm., OffAram., Phoen., Pun. *ḡrn* id. (NWSI II, 1034; Rabin, 1975: 88).

3.2.33a Some derivatives of this IE-HS stem are:

IE: OE. *hyrne* “corner”, ON. *horn*, Ir. *cerna* id.

HS: CA *ḡurna-tu* “corner”, Syr. *ḡurnita* id., Pun. *ḡrn* “corner” (NWSI II, 1034), Sab. *ḡrn* “garrison” (SD, 107).

3.2.33b IE: OE. *heorot* “deer, stag”, ON. *hjortr*, OHG. *hiruz* id.

HS: CA *ḡurhudu* “young of wild goat”, all, including IE-HS words below, are orig. “horned animal”.

3.2.33c IE: Grk *krīós* “ram”.

HS: either the root in Eyp. *kr’w* “goat” or in CA *ḡarrāzu* “ram”, Sab. *ḡrḡ* id. (SD, 107). It appears that final /-ḡ/ in Sab. and CA final /-z/ are from orig. /ḡ/ or /ḡ/.

3.2.33d IE: Lat. *cervus* “stag”, W. *carw*, Corn. *carow* id.

HS: CA *ḡarha(mu)* ~ *ḡarhabu* “aged ox, aged wild goat”.

3.2.33e IE: W. *ceraint* “relative”, Br. *kerent*, pl., id, Ir. *care* “friend”.

HS: CA *ḡarīnu* “comrade, companion, match”.

**3.2.34** Proto-IE-HS stem [qur-] with various exts “cold, freezing”. The stem is seen in Skt. *ćícira* “cold”, Lat. *circius*, *cercius* id. (= SL *m-’ar*’is fr. *m-’ar’kis* “cold”), CA *qarru*, *qurru* “cold”, Eth. *qwarīr*, Heb. *qar*, Syr. *qarrīrā* id. (Rabin, 1975: 87, n. 15), Ga. *kore* id., Chad.: Housa *kararā* “cold” (HSED, n., 1554).

IE: OHG. *hroso* “ice, crust”, ON. *hjern* “hard snow”, Arm. *sarn* “ice, frost”. IECD, 613; WP. I, 479f.

HS: Heb. *qāraš* “freeze; freezing”, Syr. *qūršā* “cold, freezing”, Mand. *qarūš* (MD: 402), CA *qārisu* “icy cold”.

With various exts: CA *qrš*, *qrkf*, *qrms*, *qrh*, etc. having to do with “cold”, Heb. *qeraḥ* “icy cold”, Akk. *qarāhu* “to freeze, become frosted” (NWSI II: 1032), etc., Berb.: *Tua geres* “freeze” (HSED, n. 1627), Egyp. *qry* “rainstorm”.

**3.2.35** Proto-IE-HS stem [qar-] “to burn, fire”

IE: ON. *hyrr* “fire”, Goth. *haurja* “coal-fire”, Lat. *carbo* “coal”, Lith. *kurti* “to light a fire”, Latv. *kurt* “heat”, OCS. *kuriti se* “smoke”. SS: §15.85; IECD, 590f; WP. I, 418; IER, 30.

HS: Akk. *qarāru* “to burn”, Egyp. *qr* “fire”, Som. *kari* “to cook, boil”, CA *sa-q(a)ru* “fire”, etc. see §2.8.28 above.

**3.2.36** Proto-IE-HS stem [qar-] “make pottery”, fr. [qar] “move”

IE: Grk *keránnūmi* “to mix”; *kéramos* “potter’s clay”, Myc. *kerameu-* “potter”. In Germ. the root means “to move” as in OE. *hrēran*, ON. *hræra*, OHG. *hruoran*, etc.: PIE \**ker-*. SS: §10.11; IECD, 610.

HS: Egyp. *qrr* “to make pottery”; *qrqr* (by redupl.) “to move”, Heb. *qirqēr* “to dance”: CA *qarru* “a kind of chariot”; *qarāriy* is a general term for ‘maker’, covering ‘tailor’, ‘potter’, ‘smith’, and the like. This general meaning has been narrowed to “tailor” (LA).

**3.2.37** Proto-IE-HS stem [qar-] “well, spring”

IE: Grrk. *krēnē* “spring, well”, Dor. *krānā* id.

HS: Ug. *qr* “well” (UG, 537), CA *qarāru* “basin, depressed ground holding water”; *qarra* “to pour out”, *qarwu* “a small basin” also “a small cup of water”, Ga. *karre* “precipice”.

**3.2.38** Proto-IE-HS word [qirb-] “bowels, belly, womb”. As in the overwhelming majority (if not indeed all) of traditional roots with medial /-r-/, the /-r-/ is either an infix or from an orig. semivowel. The word above is from stem [qib-]: see §3.2.31 above and reread carefully §2.12.40, n. e above.

IE: OE. *hrif* “belly, womb”, OHG. *href* “womb, abdomen”, Mlr. *cri* “belly”, Lat. *corpus* “body, flesh”. SS: §4.47; IEV, 102; WP. I, 460; IECD, 567.

HS: Assy. *qirbu* “bowels, interior” (King, 1989: 382), Heb. *qereb* “bowels, interior of the body, belly or stomach” (OT, 941), Ug. *qrb* “vulva” (UG: 537), CA *qur(qu)bu* “belly” with *qurbu* “flank”: *qirābu* “bag”, Amh. *qurbāt* “skin”.

**3.2.39** Proto-IE-HS stem [qur-] with various exts “wound; blood”

IE: Lat. *cruor* “blood from a wound, gore”, *crūdus* “raw”, OIr. *crū* “gore, blood”, OCS. *krŭvŭ* “blood”, Grk *kréas* “meat, flesh”, Skt. *kravis* “raw flesh” ; *krūras* “wounded”, OE. *hrēaw* “raw”, Av. *xrū-* “raw flesh”: PIE *\*kreu-*, *\*krū-*, etc. SS: §4.15; IEV, 147; WP. I, 478f; CCG: §18.

Sturtevant-Hahn (HG: §79) connect Hitt. *kur-zi* “cuts off”, *ku(u)-ru(u)-ur* “hostility” with the IE words above as well as with Skt. *krūras* above and with Lat. *corium* “hide”, *carō* “flesh”, etc., and reconstruct IE *\*kwer(n)ty*.

Hitt. *kur-* “to cut” = Lith. *kerti*, Skt. *kṛt*, etc. id.: Akk. *karātu*, etc. id. (§3.2.28 below). For Lat. *corium* above = CA *ḫurāma-tu* “a piece of hide”, etc. §3.2.45 below.

HS: [*ḫur-*], with different exts, “blood, wound”:

With *’-ext.*: CA *ḫur’u* “menstrual blood”: *ḫara’a-t* (*t* = she) “to see blood”. CA *r. /rḫ’/* centers around the notion of ‘*blood*’ and it may therefore be fr. */ḫr’/* by metathesis: *raḫa’a* “cease to bleed”; *raḫū’u* “a medicine put on blood to dry it up or on wounds to stop bleeding” also “hemostasis” (LA).

With *ḫ-ext.*: CA *ḫurḫu* “wound” with *ḫarḫa-tu* “ulcer”, Sab. *ḫrḫ* “wound” (SD, 107);

With *t-ext.*: CA *ḫari-ta*, used only with blood, “become dry”;

With *p-ext.*: Egyp. *ḫrf* “ulcer”, CA *ḫarfu* “red”, etc.

To Proto-IE-HS [*qur-*] also belong OIr. *crūaid* “hard”, fr. *crū* “blood”, Lat. *crūdus* also “crude, cruel” (SS: §15.74) = Shil. *kur* “be hard”, Kab. *ḫor* id., Ga. *kura* “dry”.

### 3.2.40 Proto-IE-HS word [*qard-us*] “strong, mighty; be strong”

IE: Grk *karterós*, *kraterós* “strong”, *kártos* “strength, might”, Goth. *hardus* “hard”, OE. *heard*, OHG. *hart* id, Skt. *karkara-* “rough, hard”. SS: §§4.81, 15.74; IER, 27.

HS: Assy. *ḫardu* “strong, brave, heroic, courageous”, *ḫurdu* “might, power”: *ḫarādu* “be strong” (King, 1898: 382), Phoen. *ḫrd-m* “strong” (NWSI II, 1032).

CA *ḫardūsu*, with the same *s-ext.* as in IE, “hard”; *ḫardasa-tu* “hardness, strength”. For CA */-s/*, see 2.1.6.9 above. It is the same IE-HS */-s/* in 3.2.34 above.

### 3.1.41 Proto-IE-HS word [*qurs-*] “horse”

IE: OFris. *hors* “horse”, OHG. *hrose*, OE. *horse*, ON. *hross* id., connected with either Lat. *currere* “to run” (IECD, 591; SS: §3.41) or with Skt. *kūrd-* “to jump” (SS: §3.41). Burrow (SL, 382), however, considers the Skt. word a loan from Dravidian languages.

HS: Heb. *ḫereš* “legendary animal having the body of a horse”, CA *ḫurās-iy* “strong camel”, with *l-ext.*: *ḫurzulu* (fr. *\*ḫursulu*) “strong horse” also name of a horse in pre-Islamic times.

For Latin *currere*: CA *karra* “to run back and forth” (§3.2.25 below).

For Skt. *krūd-*: CA *ḫardaḫa* “to run very fast”. Also belong here Grk *kórdos* “dance” (PIEP: §15.5e): stem [*ḫar*] “move” (§3.2.36 above).

### 3.2.42 Proto-IE-HS word [*qury-*] or [*qary-*] “village, people, army”

IE: OPers. *kāra-* “army, people, nation”, Lith. *karias* “army”, Goth. *harjis* “army”, OE. here, OSax., OHG. *heri* id., Grek *koiranos* “leader”, Hitt. *kuriwanas* “governor”. PIE *\*kor-*, *\*koryos-*. SS: §20.15; IECD, 535; WP. I, 462; IEV, 50. It is important to keep in mind that Grm. */h/* is from *\*k̑*.

HS: Egyp. *ḳr* “inhabitant, dweller”; *ḳrw* “leader”, OAram., Palm. *ḳryt*, Pun. “town, village” (NWSI II, 1033-1034, 1037), Phoen. *ḳrt* “city” (PG, 144), Ug. *ḳryt* id. (UG, 531), Heb. *ḳiryah* “village”, CA *ḳarya-tu* fem. id., pl. *ḳurā*; *ḳāriya-tu arch.* “God’s men on earth, i.e. *righteous men*”, *ḳawārī* also arch. and *a very strange pl. form* “God’s witnesses on earth”<sup>295</sup>; sg. *ḳār-un*; *ḳaraw-tu*, with ‘earth’ as object, perh. “I get to know its people generation after generation”.

For notion of ‘*army*’: PChad. \**k-r-* “to quarrel”, Cush.: Moča *kari-ye* id., etc. (Müller, 1975: 70, n. 79), CA *ḳarā* “to strike with a spear”.

### 3.2.43 Proto-IE-HS word [qarṭ-] “to cut, pierce”

IE: Skt. *ćatāmi* “to pierce”, Lat. *certāre* “to fight”. IECD, 613.

HS: Heb. *ḳirtēm* “to rend, tear, cut”, CA *ḳaraṭa* “to cut”; *ḳurṭu* “killing”, *ḳarṭama*, etc. “to cut”, Eth. *ḳrṭ* “to cut”, Tna. *ḳərṣi*, Amh. *ḳurṭ* id. HED, 130.

### 3.2.44 Proto-IE-HS word [qar’-] “weapon”

IE: Skt. *ćaruh* “arrow”, Av. *sūrō* “lance, pike”, Goth. *hairus* “sword”, OS. *heru* id. IECD, 614; WP. I, 410.

HS: Egyp. *ḳr’* “shield”, CA *ḳirā’u* “fighting with swords”: *ḳara’a* “to strike” (see §3.2.47 below).

### 3.2.45 Proto-IE-HS word [qurm/-n] “hide”

IE: Skt. *carman-* “hide”, Lat. *corium* “hide, leather”, ON. *horund* “skin, flesh”: Lat. *carō* “flesh”, Umb. *karu* “piece, part, flesh”: PIE \**ker-*, \**keren-*. SS: §§4.12-4.23; IECD, 476; WP. II, 573ff; DRLE, 86ff.

HS: Egyp. *ḳ’rm’ty*, *ḳ’rnty* “foreskins”, CA *ḳarma-tu*, *ḳurāma-tu* “a piece of hide”: *ḳarama* “to cut (usu. *a piece of hide*)”; *ḳaramu* “inordinate desire for *meat/flesh*”, Heb. *ḳerūm* “hide, membrane, pellicle”, Ga. *kormomo* “wart”.

### 3.2.46 Proto-IE-HS word [qar’/ḥ-] “to choose, distinguish”

IE: Grk *krīvō* “to choose” also “decide, judge”, Lat. *cernere* “to separate, distinguish, sift”, *certus* “certain”, Goth. *hrains* “clean”, ON. *hreinn* id., OE. *hridder* “sieve”. SS: §15.87; WP. II, 585; RDLE: 87f.

HS: Sab. *ḳr’* “to draw lots” (SD, 106), CA *’iḳtirā’u* “drawing lots”: *’iḳtara’a* “to choose, select” ~ (/’/ interchanges with its voiceless counterpart /ḥ/) *’iḳtaraḥa* id. and also “to suggest”; *ḳaraḥu* “pure, clean, or unmixed (water)”.

### 3.2.47 Proto-IE-HS word [qara’-] “to break”, related to [qara’-] in §3.2.45 above.

IE: Lehmann (PIEP: §12.5e) derives Skt. *ćirta*, *ćūrta* “broken”: *ćr-* “to break” from a root with a laryngeal after /r/ = CA *mi-ḳra’a-tu* inst. defined in LA as “a tool like an *ax used to break stones*”, prob. a kind of ‘*hammer*’: *ḳara’a* “to beat, strike, knock”, Heb. *ḳāra’* “to rend in pieces, rend asunder” (OT, 945), Som. *kar* “part”.

<sup>295</sup> It is termed *strange* because it looks as if it were from [ḳWr] rather than [ḳrW]. Moreover, this pl. stem is usu. fem. as in *ḡawārī*, *’awārī*, etc. I have already expressed my view on such CA pl. forms, which are indicators of the primeval proots.

### 3.2.48 Proto-IE-HS stem [qarw-] “to strike”

IE: Skt. *ćarvāmi* “hurt, kill”, Umb. *cerf* “harsh, bitter”, MHG. *hare* “harsh”, etc. IECD, 614.

HS: Sab. *ḳrw* “to punish” (SD, 107), CA *ḳarā* “to strike”, PChad. *\*kr-* “to quarrel”, Cush.: M. *kari-ye id.*, etc. (Müller, 1975: 70, n. 79), DA *ḳrr* “be inimical” (NWSI II, 1036).

### 3.2.49 Proto-IE-HS stem [qary-] “back”

IE: OE. *hrycg* “back”, OHG. *hrucki id.*, ON. *hryggr* “backbone, back, spine”.

HS: CA *ḳarā* “back”, Syr. dial. *ḳerkuj id.*, Har. *ḳaru* “shoulder blade”, Som. *ḳōr* “neck and shoulder” (HED, 128).

### 3.2.50 Proto-IE-HS word [qurt-] “ring”, related to words in §3.2.43 above

IE: OE. *herþan* “testicles”, Icel. *hreðjar id.*

HS: Egyp. *ḳrt* “ring”, CA *ḳurṭu* “ear-ring”.

### 3.2.51 Proto-IE-HS stem [qal] ~ [qar] “to burn”. for [qar-], see §3.2.35 above.

IE: Skt. *ćrā-* “to cook”.

HS: CA *ḳalā* “to fry”, Assy. *ḳalū* “to burn”, Heb. *ḳālah* “to roast”.

### 3.2.52 Proto-IE-HS stem [qaṣ-] “to cut”

IE: Skt. *ćas-* “to cut”; *ćastram* “knife”, Lat. *castrāte* “to castrate”, Grk *késtros* “graving tool”, Oss. *sasari* “lancet”: PIE *\*kes-*. IECD, 614; SL, 289; SS: §3.14; WP. I, 448.

HS: Egyp. *yḳs caus.* “to cut”, CA *ḳaṣṣa id.* also “to scissor”, Heb. *ḳaṣṣaṣ* “to cut off” (OT, 933ff), Phoen., Pun. *ḳṣy* “to cut off” (NWSI II: 1022).

### 3.2.53 Proto-IE-HS stem [qāṣ-] “to punish”, a deriv. of *\*qaṣ* “to cut”.

IE: Skt. *cās-* “to punish”, Arm. *sastem* “to scold, threaten”, Mlr. *cas* “harsh, cruel”, W. *cas* “odious”, OE. *hæst* “violent”, ON. *hast-* “harsh, violent”. IECD, 602f; WP. I, 358.

HS: CA CIII *ḳāṣaṣa* “to punish”; *ḳāṣāṣu* “punishment, penalty”, Sab. *ḳṣṣ* “to pay off a debt” (SD, 109), Egyp. *ḳs* “violence”, Ga. *kosa* “to abuse”.

#### *Comments*

Attention should be paid to the fact that ‘*to punish*’ can be expressed by CIII above, and not by CI or CII.

### 3.2.54 Proto-IE-HS stem [qaṣ-] “to speak”

IE: Arm *asem* “to speak, say, tell”, Alb. *them* “to say”, OCS. *setŭ* “says”, Skt. *cāsmi* “to teach, order”, Av. *sasmi* “to speak, order”, *sāsmi* “to teach”. IECD, 614; WP. I, 403.

HS: CA *ḳaṣṣa* “to relate, narrate”, *ḳiṣṣa-tu* “story”, Har. *ḳosa* “joke”, A. *ḳosa*, etc., Cush.: Ga. *ḳōsa*, Som. *koṣ id.* (HED, 130).

### 3.2.55 Proto-IE-HS stem [qaš-] “spear, bow”

IE: Grk *késtra* “pole-axe”, Lith. *kestē* “pole”, kasti “to dig”, Ir. *ceis* “spear”, W. *ces* “dividing-point”: Toch. *käs-* “to cut”. IECD, 494.

The HS cognate words may be either:

(a) Egyp. *ḳs* “spear”, Akk. *ḳaštu* “bow”, Ge. *ḳast*, Chad.: Mbara *kese* “arrow”, Musgum *kise* “bow”, Tumaq, Migama *kēse* “bow” (HSED, n. 1560).

(b) Ug. *ḳṣ’t* “bow” (UG, 531): CA *ḳaša’a* “to break”; mi-*ḳṣa’u* “sharp (sword)”, Heb. *ḳāša’* “to scrape, cut” (OT, 935).

A study of the etymologies of both words reveals that *ḳšt* is the actual cognate.

### 3.2.56 Proto-IE-HS stem [qus-] “price, payment”

IE: Hitt. *kuššan* “pay, price”, OE. *hȳrian* “hire; payment”, Dan. *hyre*, Sw. *hyra* “hire”.

HS: CA *ḳuštu* “payment”: *ḳassaṭa* “to pay by installments”, Egyp. *ḳst* “market”.

### 3.2.57 Proto-IE-HS stem [qau-] “master”, fr. [quw-] “strength, power” (§3.2.61 below)

IE: Goth. *heiwa-* (in *heiwa-hauja*) “master”: OIr. *coīm* “dear, beloved”, etc. see §3.2.62 below.

HS: CA *ḳaiyimu* “master, chief”, Sab. *ḍ-m-ḳmt-n* “person in authority” (SD, 111) = CA *ḍu maḳāmin* or *ḍu maḳāmatin* id.

### 3.2.58 Proto-IE-HS stem [qau-] “be awake, aware”.

IE: Grk *koēō* “to notice, observe”, Lat. *caveō* “to take heed”, Goth. *hausjan* “to hear”, OE. *hāwian* “to observe”, etc. SS: §4.63; IECD, 483; WP. I, 368ff; DRLE, 90.

HS: Chad.: Maha *kai* “to see”, Boghom *kwa*, Ngizim *ika*, Tumaq *ka* id. (HSED, n. 1522), etc. see §2.12.14 above and §3.2.74 below.

Also belong here Egyp. *ḳyw* “to wake up”, Som. *ki’i* “awaken”, Ga. *kaa* “to rise, get up”.

CA *ḳāta* arch. “to preserve, guard, protect, bear witness” belongs here. The derivative *muḳāta* occurred in the Koran (4: 85). The word is directly derived from [wḳy] as in Ug. *wḳy* “to guard”, CA *waḳā* “to guard, protect” (§3.10.38 above).

### 3.2.59 Proto-IE-HS stem [qeq-] “to burn”, fr. an ext. of proot seen in words for “shining”.

IE: Skt. *ćuc-* “to burn, glow”; *ćuci-*, *ćukra-* “bright”, Av. *suč-* “to burn, flame”, Latv. *sūkstēt* “to burn”, etc.: PIE *\*ḱeuk-*, *ḱeuq-*, etc. IECD, 642; SS: §15.57; WP. I, 378.

HS: Egyp. *kk* (\*ḳḳ) “to burn, heat”, Som. *ḳiḳ* “smoke”, CA *ḳūḳu* [ḳwḳ] “bald(ness)”, orig. “shining, bright”. For the semantic relationship between “bald” and “shining”, OCS. *vūz-lysū* “bald” = Skt. *rućant-* “shining”; Grk *phalakrós* “bald” = Skt. *bhāla* “splendor”, Lith. *baltas* “white”; CA *ṣala’a’u* “prominent, polished, and shining” is fr. *ṣala’u* “baldness; bald” and so is the verb *ṣala’a* “be clear (sky)”; etc.

### 3.2.60 Proto-IE-HS stem [qād-] “to lead”

IE: Goth. *haitan* “to command”, OE. *hatan*, OHG. *heizan* id.

HS: CA *ḳāda* “to lead”; *ḳā'idu* “leader, commander, chief”, Tham. *ḳwd* “to reign, rule”.

**3.2.61** Proto-IE-HS proot [quw-] “strength, power” as a vb [ḳā-]: see §§3.2.3 & 3.2.57 above.

IE: Grk *kūros* “power”, Skt. *śūrah* “strong”: *śavas-* “strength”, Av. *sū-rū-* “strong”, Ir. *coranta* “strong, brave”, W. *cawr* “giant”: PIE \**ḱeu-*. SS: §4.81; Meillet, *Introd.* 229; IECD, 645; WP. I, 365.

HS: CA *ḳawiyu* “strong”; *ḳuwwa-tu* “strength, power”: *ḳawiya* “be strong”, *ḳawwā* “to strengthen”, Heb. *ḳāwā* “strength, might” (OT, 917), Syr. *ḳawya* “strength”, Kab. *ḳuu id.*, Egyp. *ḳw* “to attack”.

**3.2.62** Proto-IE-HS stem [qaum] “people, clan”, related to [quw-] above.

IE: Lith. *šeima* “family”, Latv. *saime id.*, Goth. *haims* “village”, OE. *hām* “village, home”, OHG. *heim id.*, OIr. *coīm*, W. *cu*, Br. *knv* “dear, beloved”. CCG: §15; SS: §§19.16; WP. I, 358f; 2.82, IECD, 632.

HS: Assy. *kīmu* “family”, Egyp. *ḳm'm* “parent”, CA *ḳaumu* “people, clan”; *'iḳāma-tu* “place of residence”; *'aḳāma* “to dwell, reside, live in a place”, Sab. *ḳwm* “locality, position” (SD, 111), Ug. *mḳm* “place” (UG, 534), Phoen. *mḳm* “place, residence” = CA *ma-ḳām id.*

**3.2.63** Proto-IE-HS proot [qau- or qā] with numerous exts “to shout, cry out”

IE: Lith. *kaukti* “to yell, howl”, Skt. *kāuti* “cries, makes a noise”, Oss. *kōwîn* “to weep”, MHG. *hiuweln* “to shriek, howl”.

With *ḡ*-ext., Skt. *kūjami* “murmur, croon”.

With *p*-ext.: Goth. *hiufan* “to wail, lament”, etc. IECD, 480f, 484, 603; SS: §18.13; WP. I, 331.

HS: CA *ḳauḳa* “to cackle”, *ḳāḳa id.*, Har. *ḳāḳ-*, Te. *ḳaḳ id.*, Cush.: Bed. *kuk*, etc. see §2.11.60 above.

With *n*-ext.: CA *naḳḳa* “to cackle, croak”

With *l*-ext.: Ug. *ḳl* “noise”, CA *ḳāla* “to tell, say”; *ḳāwala* “to negotiate”, Akk. *ḳālu* [ḳwl] “to shout”, Phoen. *ḳl* “sound, voice”. The same /-w-/ may be dropped as in Can. and Aram. words. In IE, *qawal-* > *qalaw-* as in Skt. *śravas* “noise, sound”, OCS. *sluti* “to call”, Toch. A *klaw-* “to announce”.

**3.2.64** Proto-IE-HS stem [qauq-] “high”, fr. a proot [qau-].

IE: Goth. *hauhs* “hill”, Skt. *kakubh-*, *kakup-* “top, summit”, Lat. *cacūmen id.*, Toch. A *koc*, B *kauc* “high”: PIE \**ḱauḱ-*. Meillet, *Introd.* 67; SS: §12.31; IECD, 481; WP. I, 371f.

HS: Egyp. *ḳ'ḳ'*, *ḳ'*, *ḳí* “high”, CA *ḳawāḳi*, pl. “elevation”; *ḳīḳu* “a mountain surrounding the earth” also “tall” (i.e. ‘*high*’), Chad.: Sura *kaa*, Chip. *kaa* “to rise”, Gudu *k'wo* “lift, raise” (HSED, n. 1523).

**3.2.65** Proto-IE-HS stem [qauq-] “water bird”, fr. [qau-] “to cackle” (§3.2.63 above).

IE: Grk *kēx* “gull”, Ir. *kag* “jackdaw”, Skr. *cakā* “bird”. IECD, 599.

HS: Akk. *kaḫū* “bird”, CA *kaḫu* “swan”, Heb. *kaḫāh*, *kaḫ* “stork”, etc. see §2.11.60 above.

**3.2.66** Proto-IE-HS proot [qau-] “cackle, make noise”, the same as [qau-] in §3.2.63 above.

IE: Toch. B *śauk* “to call”, Litk. *šaukti* “to shout”, fr. [qau-] + prefixed caus. [ša-].

HS: CA *kaiku*, *kaiku*, *kaḫwu* “cackle, as a call for sex”, *kaḫa* “make noise, cry out (ostrich)”, Har. *kaḫ* “cackle (of hen)”, Tna. *kaḫāwā*, Bed. *kuk*, etc. see 2.11.60 above.

**3.2.67** Proto-IE-HS stem [qawad-] “threaten, punish”

IE: Goth. *hwōtjan*, ON. *hōta* “to threaten”, OE. *hwettan* “to urge, encourage”, ON. *hvetja* id.

HS: CA *kaḫada* “to punish” also “to revenge”.

**3.2.68** Proto-IE-HS proot [qau-] “to hollow”

IE: Grk *koīlos* “hollow”, Lat. *cavāre* “to hollow out”, *cavus* “hollow”, *cavea* “cave, den”, Mlr. *cua*, W. *cau* “hollow”, Br. *keo*, Corn *cow* “cave” also “hollow”, sor “cave, den”, Lith. *sova* “hollow of tree” : PIE \**keu-*. IECD, 604; SS: §12.72; WP. I, 365f; DRLE, 90.

HS: CA *kaḫwara* “to hollow; hollow”, Egyp. *ḫʾr* “hollow, hole”; *ḫʾrr* “cellar”, Heb. *ḫūr* “to dig (for water)”, etc. see §2.12.40, esp. n. a-d above.

**3.2.69** Proto-IE-HS stem [qaup-] “to choke”

IE: Goth. *af-hwapjan* “to choke”, Grk *kapnos* “smoke”, Lith. *kvapas* “breath, odor”.

HS: Egyp. *kyf* “be choked”, Ga. *kufa* “to cough”.

**3.2.70** Proto-IE-HS stem [qaiʾ-] “to vomit”

IE: OE. *hwōstan* “to cough”, OHG. *huostēn*, ON. *hōsta* id., Skt. *kās-* id., Lith. *kosėti*, Latv. *kāsēt* id., OCS. *kašīljati* id.

HS: Egyp. *ḫys* “to heave up, vomit”, *ḫʾs* “to vomit”, *ḫʾ* “vomit, sickness”, Akk. *kaū* CA *kaʾa* “to vomit”.

**3.2.71** Proto-IE-HS proot [qai-] with various exts “black”

IE: Skt. *cyāva-* “dark-brown”, *cyāma-* “black”, Av. *syāva-* “dark-brown”, Lith. *šemas* “blue-grey, grey”, *šyvas* “grey”, Alb. *thimë* “grey, hoary”, Ir. *cīar* “dark, grey”, ON. *hār*, OE. *hār* “hoary”, *hæwe* “blue, grey”, etc.: PIE \**kei-*. IECD, 622; SS: §15.56; WP. I, 360f; Meillet, *Introd.*: 368; IEV, 239; IER, 28.

HS: Egyp. *ḫʾm* “black” with *ḫʾmm* “be black”, etc. see §2.8.32 above and also §3.2.72 below.

An ext. /-r/ as in some IE words is seen in CA *kaḫru* [ḫyr] “tar”; *kaḫyāru* “a horse, so-called because of its black color”.

**3.2.72** Proto-IE-HS proot [qai-] “form, shape”: see §3.4.5 below.



IE: Goth. *hiwi* “shape, form”, OE. *hiw* “form, appearance, color”, ON. *hy* “brown”: *hæwe* “blue”, etc. above”.

HS: Egyp. *ḳy* “form, shape”, with n-ext.: CA *ḳaiyana* “to decorate (with different colors), embellish, beautify” hence *ḳaiyina-tu*, fem, “hairdresser”; *ḳaiyinu* (Huḏaiyil dial.) “one who wears fine clothes”: *ḳāna* “to create”, prob. orig. “to fashion”.

### 3.2.73 Proto-IE-HS stem [qail-] “to rest; time”

IE: Goth. *hweila* “period of time, hour”, ON. *hwīla* “resting place, bed”, Lat. *quiēs* “to rest”: OPers. *šiyāti* “well being, happiness”, Av. *šaiti-* “joy”: *šya-* “rejoice”.

HS: CA *ḳailūla-tu* fem. “noon”: *ḳāla* “to take a nap, to lie down at noon”.

### 3.2.74 Proto-IE-HS proot [qau- or qai-] “to wait”

IE: OCS. *čayati* “to await, expect”.

HS: OAkk. *kwy* “to wait” (Gelb, 1961: 187), Assy. *ḳā'u* “to wait”, Heb. *ḳwy* id. (Ryder, 1974: 132), Amh. *ḳäyyä* id. See §2.10.14 & §3.2.58 above.

### 3.2.75 Proto-IE-HS proot [qē-] “field”

IE: Goth. *haiþi* “field”, OE. *hæþ* “heath”, Mlr. *coit* “wood”, OCor. *cuit* id., etc. IECD, 461; WP. I, 328f.

HS: Egyp. *ḳi* “field” also *ḳw-t* “farm”.

### 3.2.76 Proto-IE-HS stem [qaiḏ-]. Grm. /h/ is from an earlier /k̑/, not /k/

IE: Lith. *kaisti* “become hot”; *kaistu* “get redhot”; *kaislas* “sweating”, Latv. *kaists* “heated”, W. *coeth* “burning, pure”, ON. *heitr*, OE. *hāt*, OHG. *heiz* “hot”: PIE \**kai-d-*, \**kai-t-*. IECD, 60, SS: §15.85.

HS: CA *ḳaiḏu* “mid-summer, heat, the hottest time in summer” ~ *ḳauḏu* id.; *ḳāḏa* “be very hot”, Egyp. *ḳ'd* “heat, fire”, Sab. *ḳyḏ* “summer season, summer crops” (SD, 112), Ug. *ḳḏ* “summer” (UG, 536), BHeb. *ḳyṣ* “mid-summer, the hottest season”, BAram. *ḳyṭ* id. (Stehle, JAOS 60, p. 517; OT, 925).

### 3.2.77 Proto-IE-HS stem [qa'-] “to lie”

IE: Av. *sāi-* “to lie”, Skt. *éti-* id., Grk *keimai* id., Hitt. *kitta-ri*, Pal. *ki-i-ta-ar* “lies”, W. *cwydd* “fall”, etc.: PIE \**kei-*. IECD, 606; WP. I. 358ff; SS: §12.14; HG: §79

HS: CA *ḳa'ā* “to sit on one’s buttocks, as dogs do”, etc. see §§2.4, 2.4.7, 2.4.8, 2.12.28, etc. above. The most widely used verb for “to sit” is *ḳa'ada*, n. *ḳi'da-tu* “a sitting”.

### 3.2.78 Proto-IE-HS proot [qau- or qai-] “shine; pure, clean, white”. The proot is often *bound* in HS.

IE: Lith. *šveisti* “to shine”; *šveitrus* “bright”, OCS. *svētū* id., Skt. *śveta-* “white”, Goth. and common Germ. *hweits* id., etc. IECD, 649; SS: §15, 64; WP. I, 469f.

To the proot above also belong:

With r-ext.: Lith. *švarus* “clean”, *švarinti* “to sweep, clean”, Pers. *suvāre*, pl., “sweeping”.

With d-ext.: Skt. *évind* “be bright”, Latv. *svidu* “to dawn”, Goth. and common Grm. *hweiteis* “wheat”.

HS: CA *tanḳiya-tu* “clean”; *naḳiy* “pure, clean, white, the best (of anything)”; *nuḳāwa-tu* “pieces of wood used in washing clothes to make them *white to the extreme*”. For HS cognates, see §§2.3.18, 2.10.38, 2.11.51, 2.12.17 above.

With prefixed /m-/: CA *ma-ḳā* “to polish, clean, wash, brush the teeth”.

Some words based on [ḳau-] may be CA *ḳauwaḥa* “to sweep, clean”, perh. Sab. *ḳwh* “to complete satisfactorily, do successfully, achieve success” (SD, 110), and CA *ḳāwiyatu* “egg”, after its ‘white’ color, Cush.: Housa *ḳwai*, Omotic: Yamma *keewa* “egg” (HSED, n. 1525). This is also true of CA *ḳwh* “sweet milk”.

With d-ext.: CA CVII *’inḳāda* [ḳwd] *arch.* “be clear, evident” as in the poet. of *ḏū Rimmah*

«...fa-(’i)*nḳādat* ’ilaihi ’al mawāridu» (LA).

**3.2.79** Proto-IE-HS stem [maq-] “long”, fr. an ext. of a proot [qau- or qa’-] in Egyp. *ḳ’* “high/long”: comp. *ḳa’* ‘ḥ’ “long life”: see §3.2.64 above.

IE: Grk *macrós* “long”, *makednós* “slender”, Dor. *mākos* “length”, Av. *mas-* “long”, OPers. *masah-* “length”, Lat. *macer* “lean”, Hitt. *maklanza* “thin, lean”, *maklatar* “leanness”, OIr. *magr* id. IHL: §41a; SS: §12.57.

HS: CA *maḳḳu* “long and lean”; *maḳaḳu* “excessive length/tallness plus leanness” (note that CA uses the same term for ‘tall’ and ‘long’), Egyp. *mḳ-t* “ladder”, which implies ‘tall/long + lean’.

**3.2.80** Proto-IE-HS stem [naq-] with exts “to destroy”, fr. an ext. of proot [’aq-/ qaW-] “destruction, ruin”: see §3.1.6.5.1 above.

IE: Skt. *nać-* “to vanish, be lost”, *nācāya-*, caus., “to destroy”, Lat. *necāre* “to kill”, *nex* “violent death”, Grk *nektós* “corpse”, Av. *nasu-* id., Tock. *nāks* “to destroy”, OIr. *ec* “death”, Corn. *ankow*, Br. *ankou*, W. *angau* id. CCG: §8.1; IECD, 833f; SS: §11.27; IEV,

271; WP. I, 326; DRLE, 134.

HS: gen. HS *naḳ-* “to destroy”, etc. See §2.8.27 above.

#### Comments

To Proto-IE-HS proot above *most certainly* belong Skt. *ćātayāmi* “to destroy”, Av. *sātar* “tyrant, fiend”, etc. (IECD, 615). See *Comments* of section §3.2.81 below.

**3.2.81** Proto-IE-HS word [naqə-d/t-] “night”. IE \**naḱt* > Grm. *naht-*, where /-d/ > /-t/, i.e. ‘voiceless’, to match that of /*k̥*/.

IE: Goth. and common Germ. *nahts* “night”, Lat. *noctis*, Ved. *nakti-* “night”, Hitt. *nekuz* “evening”; *nekuzi* “goes to bed”, Alb. *natë* “night”, Lith. *naktis* id., OIr. *in-nocht* “to-night”. SS: §14.42; CCG: §52; WP. II, 337; Sturtevant-Hahn (HCG: §66) reconstruct IH \**nekwts*.

HS: Egyp. *nḳdd* “to sleep”, but CA *nḳd* conveys the opposite meaning: *’anḳada* “spending the night awake” i.e. *’not to sleep*”, preserved in the proverb «*bāta bi lailihi ’anḳada or ’anḳaḏa*”. For an in-depth study of [*nḳd*], see §2.11.50 above.

It is sufficient to draw attention to an obvious fact that Egyp. [*nḳdd*] above is from *ḳdī* ~ *ḳddī*, “to sleep”, n. *ḳd-t* “sleep”; *ḳdw* “sleepers”, and that the forms with /-dd/, esp. *ḳddī*, seems to correspond to Grk *καθεύδω* “to sleep”.

### Comments

Despite the lengthy discussion of the CA word in Chapter II, I still have a few words to say about a semantically similar word that may or may not be related to it. The word is arch. *šaḳiḏu* and expresses “one who rarely sleeps”, often used with *’ain* “eye” to express the same meaning or “one having an evil-eye”; *šaḳiḏa* “be sleepless” = Heb. *šāḳad* (instead of \**šāḳaz*) “be sleepless, be wakeful, to wake”. A basic question arises here: *Is there any relation between this word and [yḳd] “wakeful, awake” as in CA CIV ’ayḳaḏa “wake up from sleep”; yaḳiḏu “wakeful” = Ug. yḳḡ, whose final /ḡ/ makes it impossible to pronounce, “be alert”, Heb. yḳṣ “awake”?* It is possible that /y-/ is a reduced form of /’ay/ “not, un-” (§2.21.1 above).

#### 3.2.82 Proto-IE-HS stem [*hḡeq-*] “to rule; rule, law”

IE: Skt. *ic-* “to rule, own”, Av. *išti-* “power, possession”, Goth. *aihts* “property”, OE. *æht*, OHG. *ēht* id. SS: §11.12; WP. I, 105.

HS: Egyp. *ḥḳ* “to rule, reign”, CA *ḥaḳḳu* “legal right”, Heb. *ḥōḳ* “law”; *ḥuḳḳāh* “constitution” (VPHS, 99, n. 97), Sab. *ḥḳḳ* “valid, binding” (SD, 69).

#### 3.2.83 Proto-IE-HS word [*hanq*] “to suffocate, strangle”

IE: Hitt. *hinkan* “death, fate, plague”, OIr. *ēcen* “necessity”, W. *angen* “necessity, fate, destiny”, OE. *ōht* “persecution, terror”. HCG: §75; PIEP: §3.4.

HS: CA *ḥanaḳa* “to suffocate, strangle, throttle”; *’ahnaḳa* “to narrow, tighten”; *ḥināḳu* “narrow(ness), distress”, *ḥunāḳu* “a kind of contagious disease” (may be identified with MSA *ḥānūḳu* “diphtheria”), Phoen. *ḥnḳ* “to strangle” (NWSI I, 389).

#### 3.2.84 Proto-IE-HS word [*’alaq*] “wound, sore”

IE: Grk *éikos* “wound, sore”, Lat. *ulcus* “sore”, Skt. *arḥas-* “hemorrhoids”. IECD, 872

HS: CA *’alaḳu* “blood”; *’a-’laḳu* “pain in the throat, swelling of the uvula”.

#### 3.2.85 Proto-IE-HS stem [*’aqa-*] “to know, think, believe”

IE: Goth. *aha* “mind”, ahjan “to think”, ON. *ætla* “to think, intend”, OHG. *ahtōn* “to consider, take notice of”, OE. *eaht* “council”.

HS: Egyp. *’ḳ* “learn”, Aungi -aq, Kwara, Kemant ax, Damot -aḳ id., Geleba ok “to know”, gidole ak id. (HSED, n. 1056), with l-ext. as in Goth. Above: CA *’aḳlu* “mind” as a vb “to think, reflect”, with d-ext.: CA CVIII *’i’taḳada* of [*’ḳd*], “to believe; assume, think”; *’i’tiḳādu* “belief, conviction, opinion”; *’aḳdu* “pledge, covenant, agreement”.

#### 3.2.86 Proto-IE-HS stem [*’aq-*] “to eat”

IE: Skt. *ac-* “to eat”, Av. *as-* id., OPers. *aš* id., connected by Mann (IECD, 236) with Toch. and Hitt. words for “to drink” in §3.2.87 below.

HS: Egypt. *ʿk* “to feed”. For cognates, see §2.17.46 above and for the ult. orig. of the stem, see §2.9.27 above.

**3.2.87** Proto-IE-HS stem [*ʿaq-*] “water; to drink”, its initial [*ʿa-*] orig. meant “abundant” (see §2.14 above). The stem may orig. denote “sea or bitter water”. In this case, the HS cognate will be *ʿuḳḳu* “water with a bitter taste” = CIV *ʿaḳā* of [*ʿḳw*] “become bitter (water); *ʿaḳṭa-tu* “river”.

IE: Lat. *aqua* “water”, Hitt. *akku-* “to drink”, Toch. *yoktsi* id., Olcel. *æger* “sea, god of the sea”, Goth. *ahwa* “river”, OHG. *aha* id., OE. *ea* id., SS: §1.31; HCG: §77; IECD, 13; WP. I, 34f; IEV, 178; IER, 1f.

HS: OEgy. *ʿwḳ* “stream, canal”, Akk. *īku* “canal, ditch” (AG, 78), Sab. *ʿwḳ* “bank” (SD, 23), CA *ʿaiḳa-tu* fem. “share of water” also “shore”.

Also belong here Gour. *əka* “water”, Gaf. *ägä* id. (VPHS, 19, n. 93), Gid. *uk* “to drink”, Ga. *uga* id., etc.

#### Comments

All IE-HS words above are related to [*šaḳaya*] as in Ug. *šḳy* “to drink”, Heb. *šāḳā* id., etc. As one may not expect, CA CI *saḳā* does not express “to drink” as in other related languages, but rather “give a drink to s.o.” and so is CIV caus. *ʿaḳā* “make s.o. drink”. I have already pointed out the real signification of CIV caus. *ʿa-* is “cause one/another” (see §2.22.1, n. 5b above). This very same meaning applies to */sa-/* of *saḳā*, i.e. *cause one* plus *-ḳaW-* “water”.

**3.2.88** Proto-IE-HS word [*ʿuqn-*] “stone”. This is, without */ʿu-/*, fr. a stem *\*ḱun-* as in CA *ḳunna-tu* fem. “top of a mountain, summit” and “hill with a sharp or pointed peak” also “sleeve”, i.e. “*edge of a shirt*”, which is in turn fr. a word [*kai-n*] as in CA *kaina-tu* fem. “vertebra (of the back)”, prob. fr. notion “high or with pointed edges”, Egy. *ḳ* “high”, this is ultimately fr. *\*ḳy-* “top, summit, mountain, stone” as in CA *ḳīḳu* “mountain surrounding the word” *ḳiḳāʿa-tu* “high coarse land with sharp peaks so rich in stones layers above layers” etc., see §2.1.64 & 2.12.45, n. 5 above.

IE: Skt. *aḱan-* “stone, rock”, Av. *asan-* “stone”, OCS. *kamy* id., Lith. *akmuō*, Latv. *akmens* id., Grk *ákmōn* “anvil”. IECD, 9ff; SS: §1.50; WP. I, 28ff; Meillet, Introd, 266; IEV, 178.

HS: Egypt. *yḳn* “a kind of stone”, Akk. *uḳnu* “lapis lazuli”, Ug. *ʿḳnw* id. (DRS VII, 607), CA *ʿuḳna-tu* “house (any structure) built *only with stone*” also “an abyss between two fissures (or two sharp edges) at the top of the mountain”, etc.

**3.2.89** Proto-IE-HS word [*šuqm-*] “sickness”

IE: Goth. *sauhts* “sickness”, OE. *suht* id., ON. *sōtt* id.

HS: CA *suḳmu* “sickness”; *saḳīmu* “sick”, etc. See §§2.2.23 & 2.12.39 above.

**3.2.90** Proto-IE-HS word for “dwelling”

IE: Lat. casa “cottage, hut” > Spanish, Italian casa “house”.

HS: Assy. kiššu “dwelling”, CA kiššu “plaster used for coating walls and ceilings of a house”: қаҗса “to plaster a house”, with r-ext.: қаҗру “place of confinement” as in the Koran (رود تاروصقم في ماخللا), later “dwelling”, only in the sense expressed by the verb қаҗара “to cut off or separate from others; confine, constrain” > MSA “palace”, Nab. қҗр “small room”.

**3.2.92** Proto-IE-HS word [qudr-] “power, might”, for its orig. see §3.2.93 below.

IE: OW. cadyr “strong”, W. cadr “mighty”, Br. kadarn “brave”: W. cad “battle”, Ir. cath, Corn. cas id., OHG. hadu- id. CCG: §61; SS: §4.81.

HS: Tham. қдр “strength, power” (Branden, 1950: 517), CA қудра-ту “power, strength”; қādiru “omnipotent, mighty, able, can”, Phoen. қдр “strengthen”, Meh. қāduur, Shh. eқаθar, қaduur “be able”.

**3.2.93** Proto-IE-HS word [quṭr-] “region, district”

IE: OIr. cathir “city, court”, OCS kotarŭ “district”, W. cader “fortress”, Br. ker “city”: Umb. catera- “to assemble”, LLat. in-castrāre “join”, etc. IECD, 479.

HS: CA қуṭru “region, country”; та-қаṭṭара “be ready to fight”; қиṭāru “connected line or file of camels positioned one behind another” (nowadays “train”) as a vb қаṭара, Heb., Aram. қṭr “to bind, tie”, BAram. қṭr pl. “knots, vertebrae, joints of the back”.

#### Comments

Words in §3.2.92-93 above come directly from the word [qary-] in §3.2.42 above by infixing /-t-/ forming both a lost stem CataC- (see §2.5 above) and CVIII stems (see §2.1.7.3 above). The bound morpheme /-t-/ is split into three allomorphs [-t-], [-d-] and [-ṭ-]. The appearance of /-ṭ-/ here and in many others words (cf. §3.4.51ff below) is a proof that it had originally existed in Proto-IE-HS as a variant form of /-t-/. A similar phenomenon persists in CA CVIII stems, where the allomorph [-ṭ-] of /-t-/ is conditioned by the presence of an emphatic in the base, [-d-] by /-z-/ also /-ḍ-/ and [-t-] elsewhere, e.g.

ḍaraba “to strike” > ’idṭaraba “be disturbed, agitated”, n. ’idṭrābu, adj. mu-ḍṭaribu.

zahara “to flourish” > ’izdahara “be flourished”.

ḍahara “to save” > ’iddahara ~ ’iḍdahara “to store up”.

ḡama’a “to gather” > ’iḡtama’a “be gathered together, to meet”.

As we continue our careful reading of this Chapter we will come to realize that PIE had the emphatic consonant as well as infixed morpheme /-t-/.

For what concerned the lost stem, its infixed /-t-/ has become part of the root in the entire IE-HS languages: see, for example, §§3.3.34 and 3.5.32 below.

**3.2.94** Proto-IE-HS proot [qai-] “black”: see §3.2.71 above.

IE: OIr. cēo “mist”, NIr. ceo id.: OIr. ciar “dark brown, grey”, OE. haar “grey”, etc.

HS: CA қāru “tar, black”, etc.

**3.2.95** Proto-IE-HS stem [’aq- ~ qa’-] “eye”

IE: Av. aši- dual “eye”, Toch. A ak, B ek “eye”, dual aśän, Skt. dual akṣiṇī id., Dor. ókkos, OCS oko “eye”, dual oči, Lat. oculus “eye”, Lith. akis “eye”, dual aki. With various exts, the proot also express such related notions as “to see”, “eyehole”, “spring, source”, “window”, “face”, “to wait”, “to watch”, “to show”, etc. IECD, 883ff, WP I, 169-171, SS: §§4.204, 4.21; DRLE, 138.

HS: the proot underlying words above and so numerous others in IE and HS is [ʼaḱ], which has already been studied in depth in §§3.2.58 & 3.2.74 above and will be seen in §§3.8.4 & 3.10.49 below.

### 3.2.96 Proto-IE-HS words [kap-] “to seize” and [qab-] “to raise”

IE: OE. hebban “to raise”, OSax. hebbian id., OIcel. hefja id., Goth. hafjan id. are connected with Lat. capere “to seize, take”, etc.

On the other hand, Goth. haban, etc. gen. Grm. “to have, hold” are also connected with Lat. capere “to seize, take”, Latv. kampt “to seize, grasp”, etc. PIE \*kap-. SS: §11.11. It is to be remembered that Grm. is /h-/ is regularly from /ḱ-/ and not from /k-/.

HS: Egyp. kp “to seize” ~ kf<sup>296</sup> id. kp, gen. Sem. kappu “palm of the hand”.

HS: CA ḱabā [ḱby] “to raise” (CA ḱabba, Heb., BAram. ḱbb, etc. “to vault, arch”: see §3.2.1 above). On the other hand, CA ḱabba “to seize”, Cush.: Som. ḱabo “to take, have, seize”, Sa. ḱab “to take”, Ga. kaba “to hold, grasp”. Here also belongs a relatively large group of kindred trilaterals expressing different shades of “seize”.

### 3.2.97 Proto-IE-HS word for ‘hundred’.

IE: Skt. śatam “100”, trī śatā-ni gavām gen. “300 of oxen”, OIr. cēt, OCS. sūto, Goth. hund id. PIE \*ḱmtom. IECD, 631.

HS: Egyp. š’-t “100”, the reading šnt of the hieroglyph has also been proposed (EHD II, 721), št’ “200”.

### Comments

Two important points concerning “ten” and “hundred” will be highlighted here.

1) Nearly all Indoeuropeanists believe that PIE word for ‘hundred’ above arose from the word for ‘ten’ as in Skt. daśa, Grk. δέκα, Goth. taihun, Lat. decem, etc. This connection makes it clear that final -\*(om) is a suffix corresponding to that of the Egyp. word above. However, all such Indoeuropeanists have failed to explain how the word was formed.

2) it is possible that IE words for ‘hundred’ had an initial laryngeal : comp. Grk. ἑκατόν “hundred”. Comp. Sab. ʾḱd “a large number”, CA ʾaḱdu-n “decade”, consisting of ʾa- “large” (§2.14 above) + \*ḱad, perh. related to ḱauṣ or ḱawṣu-n “one hundred sheep”.

<sup>296</sup> The exact CA cognate is [ḱf] having to do with ‘finger(s)’ and it is from \*kf<sup>\*</sup>, which cannot occur for seq. const.

### 3.3 *PROTO-IE-HS /k/*

Proto-IE-HS /k/ is a voiceless velar stop. It is in IE /k/ (> \*k, \*k<sup>w</sup>) and in HS /k/.

#### 3.3.1 Proto-IE-HS proot [ka-] “as, when, also”

IE: Lith. *kaĩ* “as, when”, Grk *kai* “also, even, though, and”.

HS: Egyp. *kí, ky* “also”, Copt. *ke id.*, Assy. *kī* “as, when”, Sab. *k id.*, CA *ka* “as, like”; *ka-ma* “also, as”, OAram. *k* “as, like”, Har. *ku-t* “as, like, in order that”, A. -*ko(m)*, S., W. -*ko*, En. -*xa*, Tna. *kām*, etc. see §§2.20.4, 2.20.5, n. 1a above.

3.3.2 Proto-IE-HS word [kabl-] “to tie; fetter”, fr. an ext. of stem [kab-], seen in IE-HS words for “tie, stick together” as in CA *kabbaba* “to form into an adhering mass”; *kubābu*, adj., “sticking together”, Lith. *kabus* “adhesive”: *kaba* “to link, join”.

IE: Lith. *kablys* “hook”, Latv. *kablis id.*, *cabe* “net-trap”, OCS. *s-koba* “brooch”, Grk *káblēs* “bolt, bar”, Arm. *kapem* “to tie”, *kapank* “fetters”, Ir. *cab* “bridle-bit, muzzle”. IECD, 457.

HS: CA *kābūlu* “net-trap”; *kiblu* “fetter”; *kabala, kabbala* “to tie, bind, bind together, fetter”, Akk. *kabālu*, Mand., Syr., JAram. *kbl* “to fetter, chain” (MD, 202), Heb. *kebel* “chain, fetter”, Talm., Syr. *kbl* “to tie, bind, bind together” (OT, 446), OffAram. *kbl* “to bind; fetter, chain” (NWSI I, 485).

#### 3.3.3 Proto-IE-HS stem [kak-] “weapon”.

IE: Skt. *kaćami* “to strike, kill”, Arm. *kasi* “to thresh”, OCS. *pri-kosnoti* “to touch”. IECD, 463.

HS: Egyp. *kk* “to strike, beat”, Akk. *kakkū* “weapon”, CA *hak(a)ka*, with prefixed *h-*, “to strike (with a sword)”; *hakku* “piercing with a spear”, OffAram. *kk* “tooth, molar”, Mand. *kaka id.*, Ga. *kuka* “rough”. See §2.3.30, n. e & f.

#### *Comments*

Skt. /-ć/ above is fr. PIE \**ĥ*, but a word \**kaĥ* is impossible to pronounce. It seems that initial Proto-IE-HS \**ka-* is a proot (see §2.17.83 above).

#### 3.3.4 Proto-IE-HS word [kala’-] “to protect, guard”

IE: Grk *kleíō* “to shut”; *kleís, klēs* “key”, Lat. *in-clūdere* “to shut in”; *clāvus* “key, nail”, Lith. *kliuti* “to stop, delay”, Alb. *qell id.*, OIr. *clō* “nail”: PIE \**klā(u)-*. SS: §12.25; WP. I, 492f; IECD, 508f; 487; IEV, 179; DRLE, 92f.

HS: Akk. *kalû* “to hold (back)” (AG, 81), Assy. *kalû* “to prevent, hold back, restrain; withhold” (King, 1898: 351), CA *kala’a* “to guard, protect, watch carefully, prohibit”, Heb. *kālā’* “to shut up, withhold, restrain; prison”, BAram, Syr., Eth. *kl’* “to prohibit” (OT, 467), Aram. *kl’*, Mand. *kla, kll*, etc. “to keep enclosed, prevent, restrain” (MD, 216), OffAram. *kl’* “to withhold, prevent, detain” (NWSI I, 508), Egyp. *k’ly-t* “place of restrain, prison” = Akk. *bīt kīli* “prison” (AG, 70).

Related words are:

3.3.4a IE: Skt. car- “to graze, pasture”, Lat. colere “to cultivate”, etc. SS: §§8.15, 3.16; WP. I. 514ff.

HS: CA kala’a “to graze, pasture”; kala’u “grass”, Sab. kl’ “pasture-land” (SD, 77), Ga. kallo “grass plot”.

3.3.4b IE: Grk kéllo “to run, drive, beach a ship”, Lat. collere “to strike, break”, Lith. kelta “ferry”, etc. IECD. 486f.

HS: Egyp. k’ly “fishing boat”, Som. kalluun “fish, fisherman”, CA kalla’a “to drive a boat or ship to the harbor”; kallā’u “harbor; ship or boat”: kalla’a “to go to, head toward”, Mand. kalia, prob. “harbor or bank” (MD, 179), Aram. kl’ “to chase”, developed from “protect, defend”.

3.3.4c IE: Skt. kalāmi “to thrust, drive”, Lith. kalti “to strike”, Latv. kalt id., OCS. klati “to stab”, Alb. kall “to thrust, insert”. IECD, 464; WP. I, 437.

HS: CA kala’a “to beat, lash”, Phoen. kly “to destroy” (NWSI I, 510), Heb. kālāh “to destroy” (OT, 469), Ug. kly “to destroy” (UG, 532).

3.3.4d IE: Skt. carama “the last, extreme”, Lat. pro-cul “far”, W., Br. pell “far”, Grk télos “end”. SS: §§12.44, 14.26; WP. I, 514.

HS: CA ’a-kla’u “the farthest, last, extreme” also “end”; kala’a “to end, finish”; Assyr. kalū “to come to an end” (King, 1898: 351), Phoen. kly “end” (PG, 111), EHeb. kl “end” (NWSI I, 507), Ga. kalati “opposite”.

### 3.3.5 Proto-IE-HS word [kalm-] “to speak, call, shout”.

IE: Hitt. kalles- “to call, invite”, Lat. calāre, clāmāre “to call out, shout”, Alb. kall “to slander”, Ukr. klamaty id.: PIE \*kal-. SS: §18.13; WP. I, 443ff; IECD, 464; DRLE, 82ff.

HS: Sab. klm “speech, word, utterance” (SD, 77), CA kallama “to speak, talk”, Har. kalḥa “to shout”; Go. at-kallam, A. a-kallam, S. at-kālā, W. at-kalä, Ms. at-xalla “to shout”, etc. HED, 92.

### 3.3.6 Proto-IE-HS word [kalm-] “be hurt, be in pain”, seems to be fr. an ext. of [kal-] as in CA kalla “grow weary, tired, become exhausted”.

IE: Skt. klāmyāmi “grow tired”, OIr. clam “leprous”, W. claf “sick”, OCorn. claf, MBr. claff id. CCG: §75.2; IECD, 507; SS: §4.91; WP. I, 98; SL, 75.

HS: CA kalmu, with m-ext. as in Skt. & OIr. above, “injury, wound”, pl. kalmā; ta-klīmu “biting remarks”, Heb. kālam “to hurt, harm, injure, *in word or deed*” (OT, 471).

With p-ext. as in W, Cor., & Br.: CA kalafu “leprous” also “chloasma”; kulfa-tu “pains, trouble”.

### 3.3.7 Proto-IE-HS stem [kil-] “a cover; covering”

IE: Skt. cela- “garment”, Lith. kailis “hide, felt”, Osc. kaila “temple, shrine”, Lat. caelum id. IECD, 460; SS: §6.12.



HS: CA *killa*-tu fem. “thin covering” also “mosquito net”; *kallala* “to cover, anything which is ‘high’, like a mountain, head, etc.”, hence also “to crown”; *’i-klīlu* “wreath, diadem, crown”, Hatra. *klyly* “crown, garland, turban” (NWSI I, 512), Heb., Eth. *kl* “to crown” (OT, 471), Mand. *kl* “to veil, cover”; *kilta*, Syr. *kl* “veil” (MD, 213), Egyp. *klm* “crown”, etc. Also CA CII *kallā* “to hide, hide oneself”.

For Lat.-Osc. words: CA *kilalu* pl. “a cell built on a grave”.

Some possibly related words are:

3.3.7a IE: Skt. *kula*- “family”.

HS: CA *kalāla*-tu “closest relatives” (Koran, 4:12), i.e. *parents, sisters, uncles, and brothers*, Sab. *kl* “tribe, race”, Som. *kolo* “clan”, Har. *kulān* “a group of persons or animals”. HED, 92.

3.3.7b IE: OCS *cělŭ* “entire, whole”, Cz. *cely* id., Russ. *celyj*, Pol. *caly* id.

HS: CA *kullu* “whole, entire, all, every”, Assy. *kullatu* id. (King, 1898: 351), Ug. *kl*, etc. (Rabin, 1975: 87, n. 1), Sab. *kl* “all”, b-klyt-hmw “unanimously” (SD, 77) = CA *bi-kuliyyati-him* id. (b = “with, in”; *kly* “all”, *him* “they masc.”).

### 3.3.8 Proto-IE-HS word [kuly-] “internal organ of the body”

IE: Grk *koilía* “bowels”, OIr. *coelan* “entrails”. IECD, 522. Also belong here W. *kuela* “testicle”, Br. *kell* id. For a different view on the etymology of Celtic words, see SS: §4.49.

HS: CA *kulya*-tu fem. “kidney”, Heb. *kilya*, Har. *kulāy*, Ge., Tna. *kəlit*, Te. *kəlkə’ot*, Som. *keli*, Ga. *kali* id. (HED, 92), Ag., Bil. *kuela* “testicles” (VPHS, 127, n. 243).

For W. & Br. words above for “testicle”: Bil. *kulā* “testicles”, Ag. *kuela*, Bed. *galo*, Kaf. *ḫuro* id., Amh. *ḫula*, Har. *ḫūr*, Ed. *ḫur’ā* id. (HED, 93).

A question rises here: is the initial consonant of these words from /k/ or /kʰ/?

### 3.3.9 Proto-IE-HS stem [kan-] “to sing”

IE: Umb. *kanetu* “to sing”, Lat. *canere* id., Grk *kan-akhê* “noise”, OIr. *canim* “to sing”, W. *canu*, Br. *kana* id.: PIE \**kan-*. IEV, 262; WP. I, 551f; SS: §18.12; DRLE, 77.

HS: Egyp. *knkn* “to sing to a beating drum, to clap the hands rhythmically”: CA *kanna* “to call, name, mention metaphorically”, *kankana*, dial., “to sing with a low voice, to whisper”, Akk. *kunnū*, Mand. *kna*, *knn* “to call, name” (MD, 219), BHeb. *kānā Piel*. “to speak kindly to any one, to address in a soothing manner”, in BAram. “to address one by his proper title” (OT, 475), Phoen. *kny* “to name”.

With r-ext.: Phoen. *knr* “lyre”, Egyp. *knrr* “harp” (PG, 113), CA *kinnāru* id., OAram. *knr* “lyre” (NWSI I, 520), whence Grk *kinúras*.

### 3.3.10 Proto-IE-HS stem [kin-] “skin, hide”

IE: OIr. cness “skin”, W. cen, Br. kenn, Cor. ken id., with a prefixed s-: ON. skinn “skin”, OHG. scintan “to skin”: PIE \*(s)ken-. SS: §4.12; WP. II, 563f; Mann (IECD: 493) derives Celtic words fr. \*kēsmn- (?)<sup>297</sup>

HS: Egyp. knmw “sacred skin”, CA kināna-tu fem. “quiver made of hide”. However, if a quiver is made from *wood* then it will be called *ḡafīr*. Ga. kunše “bark, fibre”. The orig. signification of [kin] is s.t. that “covers, protects”.

### 3.3.11 Proto-IE-HS stem [kan-] “hearth, brazier”

IE: Grk káminos “furnace, kiln”, Lat. camīnus “furnace, fireplace”

HS: Akk., CA kānūnu “hearth, brazier”, Mand. kanuna id. (MD, 198), Berb. kanun “fireplace”.

### 3.3.12 Proto-IE-HS stem [kapp-] “to bend”

IE: Grk kámpto “to bend, turn”, Ir. camaim id., W. camu “bend”, OIr. camb “crooked”, Lith. kumpas “bent, crooked”, OS. hābian “be lame”, Arm. cam “bent”: PIE \*kamp-. SS: §9.14; IECD, 468; WP. I, 350.

PIE \*kamp- is actually from \*kapp-, with the first \*p dissimilating to /m/. *This process of phonological change is quite common in IE and HS, and has provided both families with very numerous traditional roots. For examples illustrating this process in HS, see §§2.17. 80, 2.23.1, n. 37, 2.23.3, n.3, etc. above. Some examples from IE are: Latv. kāmpt “to seize” is from Balt. \*kapp-, with /-m-/ for an earlier \*-p-: cf. Lat. capere id. (§3.3.13 below); Lat. lambere “to lick” is from \*labbere, with /-m-/ for an earlier \*-bh-: cf. Lat. labium “lip”, OHG. laffen “to lick” with leffur “lip”, etc.*

HS: Akk. kapāpu “to bend”, Mand. kpa, kpp “to to bow, bend, turn up”, Syr. kpp “to bend” (MD, 208), Heb. kāpā, kāpap “to bend, bow”, BAram., Talm. kp’ “to bow”, CA kafa’a “to turn away, turn aside” (OT, 484-485), also CA /kff/ as in ta-kaffafa “to turn”; ’istakaffa “to encircle”; kifāfu “bow”, Hatra, Palm. kph “arch, vault, vaulted room, bent”, Hatra also kpp “vaulted room” (NWSI I, 529,531)<sup>298</sup>.

Some derivatives are:

3.3.12a IE: Arm. kapank “enclosure, trap”, W. caffio “to catch”

HS: CA kiffa-tu “a kind of trap, snare”, Egyp. kpw, pl., “snarer, hunter”: kep “to seize”.

3.3.12.b IE: Hitt. kappis “measure of capacity”.

HS: Aram. kp “measure of grain”. In Arabic kaff is used as ‘measure of grain’ as in *kaff’ adas*.

<sup>297</sup> CA kasmu-n “shape of the body”, ḡismu-n “body”, both are fr. ḡuθmānu, which is in turn fr. ḡuθθa-tu fem. All have nothing to do with IE-HS words above.

<sup>298</sup> Te. kaf-, Tna. kof- “to sit”. The relation between the meanings “bend” and “sit down” could be explained by the bending position one takes while sitting down.

**3.3.13** Proto-IE-HS stem [kap-] “to join together, sew”, related to [kap-] “to bend” above.

IE: Alb. qep “to sew”, Lith. kempu, kepti “to stick, adhere”, Latv. kept id., Ukr. -čepyty “to attach”. IECD, 489.

HS: CA kaffa “to sew, hem on” also “to join together”; CX ’istakaffa “stick together”.

With suffixed /t-/: CA kafata “to attach, join”, etc. See §2.9.1 above.

**3.3.14** Proto-IE-HS stem [kap-] “to take, seize”, related to [kap-] “join together” and “bend” above.

IE: Lat. capere “to seize, take”, Latv. kampt “to seize, grasp”, Grk kápō “to seize, take”, Alb. kap “to take, seize”: PIE \*kap-. SS: §11.11; IECD, 471; WP. I, 342.

HS: Egyp. kep “to seize”, Pun. kpp “to take away” (NWSI I, 530), CA kaffa “to collect”, CV ta-kaffafa “to take or seize with the hand”: kaffu “palm of the hand”, Egyp. kp “hollow of the hand”, Akk. kappu “(palm of the) hand”, Ug. kp (UG, 531), Phoen. kp (PG, 112).

**3.3.15** Proto-IE-HS word [kap’-] “to seize, take; buy”, related to [kap-] above.

IE: OCS and common Slav. kupiti “to buy”

HS: Egyp. kf’ “to seize, grasp, plunder”, CA ’istakfa’a, CX of [kf’], “to hold under a lease or agreement”.

**3.3.16** Proto-IE-HS word [kapr-] “sheep, goat”

IE: Lat. capra “goat”, etc. IECD, 472; WP. I, 347. Buck (SS: §3.36) tends to connect OIr. and common Celtic gabor “goat” with Lat. capra above (masc. *caper*).

HS: Assy. kaparru “sheep-boy” (King, 1898; 354), CA ġafra “young of goat or sheep”, BHeb. kəpōr “young lion” (OT, 484), Phoen. kpr-t “lioness” (NWSI I, 530).

**3.3.17** Proto-IE-HS stem [kap-] “to cut”; pass. [kup-] “be cut”

IE: Lith. kapoti “to chop up”, Grk kóptō “to cut with a blow”; kopís “cleaver”, OCS kopati “to dig”, Alb. kep “to chip, carve”, Lat. capulare “to cut”: PIE \*kop-. IECD, 531; SS: §12.21; WP. II, 559; DRLE, 85.

HS: CA kaffa “to cut off, shorten”, Pun. kp “to break” (NWSI I, 530-531): Egyp. kaf “knife”. See §2.8.10 above.

With l-ext. as in Lat. above: Ge., Tna. kāfāla “to divide”, Te. kāfla id., Amh. kāffālā id., Har. kāfāla “to separate” (HED: 91).

**3.3.18** Proto-IE-HS word [kap’-] “to drop”, fr. the same stem in OCS. kupiti “buy”, Egyp. kf’ “seize, plunder” in §3.3.15 above.

IE: OCS, Russ. kaplja “drop”, Cz. kapka id., OCS. kapati “to drip”.

HS: CA kafa’a “to let fall, to drop”: CVII ’inkafa’a “to retreat, fall back”, Ga. kufa “to fall”, Som. kuf “to fall”. Zaborski, 1975: 327.

**3.3.19** Proto-IE-HS word [karp-] “skull”

IE: OPers. kerpetis “skull”, Skt. karpara- “skull, potsherd”, OCS. črêpê “potsherd”, Russ. čerep id., čerepok “potsherd”, OHG. scirbi id., Arm. čerep “ladle”: PIE \*kerp-, \*kerep-, etc. SS: §4.202; IECD, 490; WP. II, 580.

HS: Oakk. karpata “skull, pot” (AG, 82), Ug. krpn “cup, goblet” (UG: 536), CA kirāfu “bucket, pail”.

### 3.3.20 Proto-IE-HS stem [kər-], with various exts, denotes *parts of the body*

IE: Lith. krūtis “breast”, krūtinė “chest”, Latv. krūts “breast, chest”, W. croth “womb, belly”, crwth “hump, lump”, Ir. cruit “hump”. SS: §4.47; IECD, 562; WP. I, 589 (IE \*qrūt-);

HS: Egyp. kry-t “chest”, CA karkara-tu fem. “chest (of animal)”, Som. kurus “camel’s hump”.

With ‘-ext.: CA kurā’u “leg, forearm”, Mand. kraia “leg, foot”, Syr. kr’, Akk. kurītu (MD, 222), Sab. kr’ “leg of a camel” (SD, 78) = Skt. cara- “hand”.

CA kursū’u “part between leg and foot, carpal end of the ulna” = Lat. crūs “leg”.

### 3.3.21 Proto-IE-HS stem [kir-], with total or partial redupl. “circle” as a vb \*kar- “to circle, turn round, rotate.”

IE: Grk kíklos, kírkos “circle, ring”, Lat. circulus id., circa “about”, circum “around”, OCS. kragû (\*krakû) “circle”, OW. cyrchinn id., Mlr. cercal id., Arm. kor, Alb. qerth “ring, circle”: PIE \*kir-, \*kirk-, \*ker-. SS: §12.82; IECD, 504; WP. II, 569; DRLE: 85f.

HS: Egyp. krkr “to circle”, CA kirkira-tu fem. “small circle jutting out in the chest of an animal, which, when the animal keels down, it touches the ground” (LA); karkara “to revolve or rotate”, Ge. ma-kurakura “wheel”, etc.

### 3.3.22 Proto-IE-HS stem [kur-] “round, humped”, fr. [kir-] “circle” above

IE: Grk kur-tós “humped, convex”, Lat. curvus “crooked, curved”, Arm. kor “curved, bent”, Ir. cor “bent, turn”, W. cōr “circle”, with a prefixed s-: Av. skarəna- “round”. IECD, 590; SS: §12.74; WP. II, 568.

HS: kura-tu fem. “sphere, globule, ball”; CA kurawī “round, spherical”; karā “be crooked (legs), bowlegged”, BHeb. \*kārar “to go or move in a circle”, hence כר “round vessel” (OT, 491), Te. korit “ball”, Tna. karara id.

### 3.3.23 Proto-IE-HS word [kakra] “circle, round”, a compound of proot [ka’] plus stem [kur- or kar-] above. For proot [ka’], see §2.17.83 above.

IE: Skt. cakra- “circle”, Grk kúklos id., Av. čakra “wheel”.

HS: Akk. kakra “round”.

### 3.3.24 Proto-IE-HS stem [kar-], with partial or total redupl. “round stone”, related to [kar- or kur] above.

IE: OIr. carric “rock”, W. carreg “stone”, Cor. carrek “rock”, Br. karreg id., Cz. kras id.: Skt. karkara- “hard”. IECD, 477; SS: §1.44; WP. I, 427.

HS: Egyp. krkr “stone boulders”, CA \*karkara-tu prob. “millstone, quern”: cf. karkara “to grind with a millstone”, Ga. kersa “grind-stone”. CA word tells that the stone was ‘round’.

**3.3.25** Proto-IE-HS stem [kar-], with partial or total redupl., “to run, turn”, a deriv. of [kar] “to make a circle, move in a circle around, turn round”

IE: Lat. currere “to run”, currus “wagon”, Ir. carr, W. car, Br. karr “vehicle, wagon”. CCG: §7.2; SS: §10.46; WP. I, 428; IECD, 591; EM. 247f.

HS: CA karra “to run” also “to turn”, Ug. krkr “to turn” (UG: 536), Har. kara “road”, Ga. karra “passage, path, way”, Som. kor “to climb” (HED, 93).

**3.3.26** Proto-IE-HS word [kər̥k-] “to cackle, croak; kind of bird”

IE: Grk kirkos “gier-hawk”, OIr. cerc “hen”, Lith. kirkti “to cackle, croak”; kirka, kiras “gull”, Cz. čirík “chirp”. IECD, 503f; SS: §3.51, CCG: §54.

HS: CA kurka-tu fem. “hen”; kurkiyyu “crane”: karaka, ’a-kraka “to cackle (hen)”, karkara “to shout at a hen”, Heb. kərūkyāh “crowned-crane, crane”, Syr. kourkoyo “a kind of bird”.

**3.3.27** Proto-IE-HS word [kirs-] “rope”

IE: OIr. criss “girdle”, Ir. crios id., W. crys “shirt”, OCorn. kreis, Br. krez id., Russ. čerez “girdle”. CCG: §25.6, SS: §6.57; WP. I, 423.

HS: Egyp. k’rs’ “rope-work, cordage”, CA ta-karrasa “to join together, combine together”; kirsu, pl., “an ornament of precious stone worn around the neck”, prob. orig. “string or thread” since the stone is pierced for *stringing* or *threading*, Ga. kiri “thread”, Amh. ker id.

**3.3.28** Proto-IE-HS stem [kar-], with numerous exts “to cut”

IE: with t- or zero ext.: Hitt. kur “to cut”, Skt. kṛṇṭati “cuts”, Lith. kerti id.;

With st-ext.: Lith. kirsti “to chop”, OCS. črěsti “to cut”;

With a prefixed s-: ON. skera “to cut”, OE. sceran id., OHG. skeran id.;

With a prefixed s- and suffixed -b-: Lith. skerbti “to gash”, OE. sceorpan “to scrape”;

With p-ext.: Lat. carpō “to reap”, Lith. kerpti “to trim, shear, chip”, Latv. cirot id.;

With s-ext.: Hitt. karsami “to cut, castrate”, Skt. karṣāmi “to plow”, Lith. kerslas “cutter, chisel”, Mlr. cerrim “to cut, tear”, etc.: PIE \*(s)ker-. IECD, 429; 1158ff, WP. II. 573ff; SS: §9.22; IEV, 264; IER, 59; SL, 75.

HS: with t-ext.: Akk. karātu “to cut”, Heb. kārat “to cut (off)” OT, 492), Moab., Phoen., Pun. krt “to cut” (NWSI I, 539), Tna. kārātā id.: CA kirtīmu “ax”.

With a prefixed s-: Egyp. skr “to cut”. It is needless to say that /s-/ in Egyp. and IE words above is caus.: see *comments* below.

With w/y-ext.: Akk. karū “to cut”, Pun. kry id. (NWSI I, 535), CA karā “to shorten” as well as “to lengthen” and also “to add” as well as “to subtract, deduct”: Egyp. krkr “knife”, Chad.: Sumray kura id., Burunge kirara “axe” (HSED, n. 1503).

With b-ext.: CA karaba “to plow”, Akk., Mand., Syr. krb id. (MD, 223).

Related words are:

3.2.28a IE: Lat. *curtus* “short, maimed”, ON. *kortr* “short”, Dan., Sw. *kort* id., Lith. *kurtinas* “deaf”, Latv. *kurls* id., OCS. *krunu* “having a mutilated nose”, *kratuku* “short”, Arm. *kurt* “eunuch”. IECED, 593; SS: §4.95; E-M: 248.

HS: Akk. *kurju* “short”, Syr. *kera*, Soq. *kiri* “be short”: CA CIV *’a-krā* “to shorten”, Housa *kurma* “deaf” (Parsons, 1975: 442), CA *kurdumu* “short”, CA *karta’u* “short”, *kurzumu* “having a short nose”, *kuršumu* “having an ugly face”.

### Comments

PIE had, exactly like PHS (see §2.2 above), a prefix /ša-/, forming causative verbs, nouns and adjectives which became an inseparable part of the root in its daughter languages, and was wrongly termed by Sturtevant ((IHL: §41e) as ‘*s-movable*’. A careful study of all IE cognate roots reveals that proot [s-] is common to all IE languages, but that its distribution differs from language to language. If we take any IE root with this caus. [s-], we will certainly find that [s-] appears in some languages but disappear in others without any consistency. This implies that [s-], whether it is *present* or *absent* in verbs (> nouns, adjectives), had lost its grammatical function and meaning in late PIE. Some illustrative examples are:

- a) OE. *sceran*, ON. *skera* “to cut” = Lith. *kertu* id., Hitt. *kur-* id.;
- b) Skt. *sthā-* “to stand” = Hitt. *titta-* id.;
- c) Lith. *stogas* “toof” = Lat. *tēctum* id.;
- d) Skt. *sthag-* “to cover” = OE. *þeccan*, Lat. *tegere* id.;
- e) OE. *slæc* “loose, slack” = Lat. *laxus* id.;
- f) Skt. *smṛt-* “memory” = Av. *mərətus* “thought”;
- g) Av. *snāvars* “sinew”, Toch. *ṣṇaur* “nerve” = Lat. *nervus* “nerve”, Grk *neūon* “sinew”;
- h) OIr. *sniim* “interlace” = Br. *neza*, Lat. *nēō* “twist, spin”;
- i) Ir. *smal* “decay” = Grk *mōlos* “soft, weak”;
- j) OCS *slina* “spittle” = Br. *līn* “pus”, etc.

Even in the same language we find a form that can freely occur with or without [s-]: cf. Skt. *stāyus* “thief” ~ *tāyus* id. The same phenomenon is widespread in HS (cf. §2.2 above).

A similar case is seen in HS languages. Consider the following two examples:

- i) Egyp. *sker* “to cut” = Akk. *karū*, *karātu* id.;
- ii) Ug. *škr* “to hire” = Heb. *karā* “to hire, rent, buy”, CA *karā* “to rent”; caus. *’a-krā* “to hire”, etc. see §2.2 above.

### 3.3.29 Proto-IE-HS stem [kir-] “garden, farm land”

IE: Hitt. *kuraš* “field”, Lyd. *qira* “property”, Av. *karšū-* “field”, *karš-* “to plow”, Skt. *krṣ-* id. SS: §8.12.

HS: Assy. *kirū* “garden”: *karā* “to dig” (King, 1898: 354), Egyp. *kry* “gardner”, Housa *karkara* “farmland”, Mand. *kry*, Heb. *karah*, CA *karā* id. (MD, 222), Ge. *kārāyā* id., Go. *kerrā-m*, A. *kirrā-m*, S. *käre*, Har. *xara*, etc. id. (HED, 97).

### 3.3.30 Proto-IE-HS word [kary-] “to buy, rent”

IE: Skt. *krī-* “to buy”, Grk *príasθai* id., Toch. *käry-* “to trade”, OIr. *crenaím* “to buy”, W. *prynu*, Br. *prena*, Cor. *prenne*, *prena* id., ORuss. *krīnuti* id.: PIE *\*k<sup>w</sup>rī-*, *k<sup>w</sup>rei-*. CCG: §55; IEV, 265; Meillet, *Introd.* 346; SL, 74; WP. I, 523f.

HS: Heb. *kārāh* “to buy, trade, rent, hire”, Pun. *kry* “to buy” (NWSI I, 535), CA *karaya*, *karā* “to rent, hire”, Ga. *kirra* “to hire”, Som. *kireyso* “to rent, hire”.

With caus. *š-*: Ug. *škr* “to hire”, and with a prefixed *m-*: Aram. *mkr* “price”, Ug. *mkr* “to sell”, Akk. *tamkaru* “merchant”, etc. See §2.2.14 above.

With */k-/* = */š-/*: CA *šarā* “to buy, trade”; *širā’u* “buying” (comp. with *kirā’u* “renting”). This form may not be due by the palatalization of *\*k-* before a *high front* */i/*. In this case, the verb *šarā* is derived from *širā’u*.

#### Comments

Another HS term for “rent, hire” is [gar-]: see §2.3.4 above. The logical conclusion to be drawn from all such variants is that this Proto-IE-HS initial */k/* in words above is from a consonant sound different from */k/*, */g/*, and */š/*. A direct reflex of this (lost) sound is CA CVIII *’i-ḳṭawai-tu* “I buy”; *mu-ḳwī* (or *mu-ḳwiy*) “seller”; *mu-ḳṭawī* (or *mu-ḳṭawiy*) “buyer”, etc.

1) Note that CA final */-ī/* ~ */-iy/* in words above = belonging to, connected with”: see §19.2.7 below. This is the real ending in the reconstructed IE-HS word above.

2) CA *ḳṭawu* [ḳw-] is a deriv. of CVIII as in the subst. *ma-ḳṭawī* “servant”, etc. (see §2.12.12 above). Its IE cognate is seen in Skt. *ceṭa-* “servant”.

**3.3.31** Proto-IE-HS word [ka’ai-] “who, whoever, what, whatever” also function as an indefinite “someone”. It is a cpd of [ka] plus the interrogative [’ai] “who, which, what, etc. see §3.17.4 below.

IE: Hitt. *kuiš*, Lat. *quis* “who”, Ved. *kas*, Av. *kō*, Lith. *kas*, OCS *kŭ-to* id., čī-to “what”, OE. *hwā* “who”; inst. *hwī* “why”, *hwæt* “what”. In redupl.: Hitt. *kuiš kuiš*, Lat. *quisquis* “whatever”, etc.

Akk. and gen. Sem., except CA, *’aika* “how, where, whence” = CA *ka’ai-*. See §§2.20.3, 2.20.4, 2.20.5, esp. n. 5a.

**3.3.32** Proto-IE-HS stem [kuš-] “tress, comb”, fr. [šu’].

IE: Lith. *kasa* “tress, braid of hair”, OCS. *kosa* “hair”, *česati* “to comb”, Hitt. *kišš* “comb”, Grk *késkeon* (*\*kes-kes-*) “coarse flax prepared for spinning, tow”, Mlr. *cir* (*\*kēs-rā*) “hair”: PIE *\*kes-* WP. I. 449f; SS: §4.14; IECD, 494.

HS: CA *kušša-tu* fem. “tress, braid of hair”, SL *kaššiš*, *šūši* (fr. *šūša-tu* fem.). For the ult. orig. of the stem, see §2.17.83.15.

**3.3.33** Proto-IE-HS stem [kat-] “baby, child”

IE: Lat. *catulus* “young of an animal”, Pol., Bulg. *koṭna* “pregnant (of cats and sheep)”: PIE *\*kat-*. IECD, 479; WP. I, 338f.

HS: Egyp. ktyt “baby, child, small, little”, CA katkūtu “chick” also “be small, *of animals or newborn animals*”, Akk. katū “be tiny, small”, Ga. kutisa “younger”. See §2.11.46, n. b above.

### 3.3.34 Proto-IE-HS word [katam-] “to hide, cover”

IE: Skt. catāmi “hide oneself”, OBr. bronn-ced “breast-cover”, Oss. catîr “tent”, Pers. cādar “sheet”. IECD, 495.

HS: Assy. katāmu “to cover, close (the lips)” (King, 1898: 356), CA katama “to hide, conceal”. See §2.8.14 above.

#### Comments

IE-HS word above is an ext. of an earlier stem [kam-] “to cover, hide”. We may note that final [-m] of the stem has been dropped or modified in some IE languages. For a study of this very important grammatical prefix /-t-/, see §2.8 above.

### 3.3.35 Proto-IE-HS stem [kū’-] “elbow”

IE: Lat. cubitum “elbow”, Grk kúbiton id.: PIE \*keu- “to bend, hollow”. SS: §4.32.

HS: Egyp. ḳ’ḥ “elbow” also “angle, corner, bent of a river”, CA kū’u “elbow”: CA ka’a “to bend, twist”; kauwa’a “to turn”, a cpd of [kuw] “bending” as in kāsa “to bend”, etc. + [’a-] “hand, arm”.

There is another CA word for ‘elbow’ based on [kū’-]; it is *ku’buratun* arch. It is doubtless that /-r-/ here is an affix added to make the pronunciation possible.

### 3.3.36 Proto-IE-HS stem [kawā- or kawy-] “to burn, sear”

IE: Grk kaíō, Attic kāw “to kindle, burn”, Alb. thaj “dry”, Av., with caus. /s-/, saokō “burning”.

HS: CA kawā “to burn, sear, cauterize”, Akk. ka’ū “to burn”, etc. see §2.7.8 above.

### 3.3.37 Proto-IE-HS stem [ka’ā- or kaya’-] “to move”

IE: Skt. cyave “to move, depart”, Lat. ciēre “to move”, Av. šavāi “I go”, Grk kiō “to move, go”, OCS. cujo se “to move”. SS: §10.11; WP. I, 361ff; IECD, 501f; IEV, 263.

HS: Egyp. k’w “to move”, Gaa. kaa “to rise, arise”, CA kā’a “to drive back, turn aside or move to an alternate course”.

### 3.3.38 Proto-IE-HS stem [vb kaum-, n. kūm-] “to heap, swell; cloud, mist”

IE: Lat. cumulus “mass, heap, pile”, W. cwmwl “cloud”, Br. koumoulenn id.: Br. koun “wave”, Ir. cum “body”, Alb. kumen “to swell”: PIE \*kūm. IECD, 586f.

HS: CA kauwama “to heap up, pile”; kauma-tu “heap”, Syr. kōma id., Heb. kīmā “a heap” (OT, 464), etc. See §2.15.11 above.

Some derivatives are:

3.3.38a IE: OIr. cumain “to shape”.

HS: Egyp. k’m-t “image, statue”.



3.3.38b IE: Latv. kumbris “hump”, Ir. comhaille “bulge, belly”, etc. IECD, 587ff.  
HS: CA kawmu “hump”, Ga. koma “chest, breast”.

**3.3.39** Proto-IE-HS word [kāw-] “make noise, cry out”

IE: Skt. kāuti “makes noise, cries, moans”, Lith. kaurti “to yell, howl”: PIE \*kau. SS: §18.13

HS: Egyp. ky’ “to cry out”, CA kāwā (~ kāwaḥa) “to insult, call *another* bad names”; ’iktawā CVIII of kawā “to boast”.

**3.3.40** Proto-IE-HS stem [vb kai-, n. kī-] “to think”

IE: Skt. cit- “to think”, Latv. šķ’ist id., Lith. skaiti “to count, read”.

HS: Egyp. k’ “to think” also “to speak, say, tell”, k’-t “thought, mediation”, CA kaiyisu “rational, endowed with reason”; kaisu “mind”: kāsa “to reason, think”.

**3.3.41** Proto-IE-HS stem [kaun-] perh. “existence”

IE: OIr. cenim “be born, spring from”, OCS. konĭcĭ “end”, Bulg. kona, Cz. konec id., Russ. kon “beginning”, Skt. kanīna- “young”.

HS: CA kā’inu “creature”, kāna “to exist, be”, CII kauwana “to create, form, establish”; Phoen. kn “to be, establish” (PG, 109-110), Akk. kānu “to establish” (AG, 81), Ug. kwn “to create” (UG, 532), Har. xāna “to be, become”, Ge., Tna. konä, Amh. Gaf., W. honä, Arg. hona, etc. HED, 97.

For Slavic words above: Assy. kanaku “to seal”, i.e. ‘end’.

**3.3.42** Proto-IE-HS stem [kan-] “to bite”

IE: W. cnoi “to bite”, Ir. cnaim “to naw, chew”, Grk knēn “to scrape”.

HS: Ga. kaniin “to bite”, Som. chenina id.

**3.3.43** Proto-IE-HS word [ka’ar-] “thorn”

IE: Skt. kharas “sharp, hard, prickly”, kharus “tooth”, Grk kárkhros “saw-like, jagged; rough, harsh”, Pers. xār(ā) “thorn, rock”. Sturtevant (Lang. 17, p. 10) reconstructs IH \*k̑̌aros.

HS: CA ka’ru “a kind of thorn”, Ga. korati “thorn”, Egyp. k’rtí-t “butcher’s knife”.

**3.3.44** Proto-IE-HS word [kau’-l/-r] “lame, deviating foot”

IE: Skt. khoras “lame”, Grk skauros “with deviating hoof”, Lat. scaurus “with swollen ankles”: IH \*(s)k̑̌auros, according to Sturtevant (Lang. 17, p. 10).

HS: CA kau’alu “with deviating foot, lame”.

**3.3.45** Proto-IE-HS stem [ka’W-] “to say”

IE: Skt. khyā- “to tell, proclaim, relate”.

HS: Egyp. k’w “to acclaim, greet”, CA ’a-k’aya, ’a-k’ā “to speak harshly (to)”, OAram. k’h “to rebuke” (AG, 11).

**3.3.46** Proto-IE-HS stem [kahy] “famous, known”

IE: Skt. khyā- in pass. means “be known, be named”.

HS: CA ’a-khā’u, pl., “nobleman” as a vb ’i-ktahā “to aggrandize, respect, revere”.

### 3.3.47 Proto-IE-HS word [ka’r] “mule”

IE: Skt. khara- “ass, mule”, Av. xara- “ass”, Pers. xar id. SS: §3.46.

HS: Egyp. k’r’ “mule”.

**3.3.48** Proto-IE-HS word [ka’d] “suffering”, fr. an ext. of a stem [ka’-] in CA ka’ā “to hurt with words”, lit. “cause pain to s.o. through (harsh) words” (§3.3.45 above). A number of trilaterals have been developed from this stem. One of them is [k’b] as in OffAram. kyb “suffering”, CA ka’iba “be sad, downcast”, ka’ību “sorrowful, depressed”, BHeb. k’b “to have pain”, BAram., Syr. k’b “be in Pain” (OT, 442).

IE: Skt. khedas “fatigue: khidyati “suffers pain”.

HS: CA ka’du “exhaustion, toil”: ka’ada, ta-ka’ada “to suffer; be exhausted, painful”; ka’ūdu “causing trouble, exhausting, arduous, trying”. By dissim. kaddu (fr. ka’du) “exhaustion”, kadda (fr. ka’ada) “to toil”, etc.

CA kahdu “fatigue” is a variant form.

**3.3.49** Proto-IE-HS stem [ka’-], related to [ka’-] above and can take caus. /š-/ in both IE and HS.

IE: Grk skhizō “to split”, Lat. scīndō id., Skt. chinati “cuts off, pierces”, OE. scītan “void excrement”.

Sturtevant (lang. 17, p. 10) tends to connect these words with Skt. khidyati “suffers” above and Skt. chyati “cuts up”, chātas, part., Lat. dēsciscō “withdraw, desert”.

HS: Egyp. skí-t “pain, anguish”, sk “to draw away”, sksk “to cut down, crush”, CA ka’ka’a “to retreat, withdraw”; muta-ka’ki’u, adj., “short”, this presupposes the former existence of a verb \*ta-ka’ka’a “to shorten, cut”.

For the OE word above, CA sakka (fr. \*sak’a) ~ with another caus. /h-/ hakka ~ a variant saġġa id.

For Egyp. notion of ‘pain’, CA saksaka-tu “physical feebleness”.

For Skt.-Grk-Lat.-Egyp. notion of ‘cut’, CA sakka “to cut off the ear”.

To stem [ka’] also belong among others Egyp. mk’ “dung, excrement” = OE. meox “dung, excrement”, OSax., OHG. mist id.: OE. mīgan “mingere”, ON. mīga id.

### 3.3.50 Proto-IE-HS stem [kakah- ~ qahqah-] “to laugh”

IE: Skt. kakhati “laughs”, fr. khakhati (cf. Meillet, Introd.: 64), OCS. xoxoti “to laugh noisily”, Grk kakházō (\*khákhazō) id., Arm. xaxankh id. IEV, 265.

HS: CA kakhaha “to laugh” ~ qahqaha “to laugh noisily”, OAram. qhqh “to laugh” (NWSI I, 1005).

### 3.3.51 Proto-IE-HS word [kalib/p-] “pot”

IE: Grk kálpis “pitcher, jug”, OIr. cilornn “pitcher”, W. celwrn “milk-pail”.

HS: Egyp. qlyby “pot of drink”, CA kalīfu “vessel for wine”.

### 3.3.52 Proto-IE-HS stem [rik-] “rain”

IE: Goth. and common Germ. *rign* “rain”: PIE \**rek-*. SS: §1.75.

HS: CA *rikku* “light rain”.

### 3.3.53 Proto-IE-HS word [karak-] “region, town”

IE: Lith. *kraštas* “country, region” also “side, edge; shore”, Latv. *krasts* “shore”.

HS: Palm. *krk* “fortified town, fortification”, OffAram., Nab. *krk*, “foundation, fortified town” (NWSI I, 535).

### 3.2.54 Proto-IE-HS word [kaḥl] “dark (in color), darkness”

IE: Skt. *kāla-* “dark, black, blue-dark”, *kalaṅka-* “spot, blemish”, *kalama-* “spot, dirt”, Grk *kēlís* “spot”, *kelainós* “black”, Lat. *cāl-īgō* “darkness”, OCS. *kalû* “mud. mire”, Lith. *kōlioti* “to abuse”. IECD, 465; WP. I, 440ff; SS: §4.66.

HS: Egyp. *kḥny* (fr. \**kḥly*) “darkness”, Akk. *ekēlu* “dark (in color)”, CA *kaḥalu* “darkness”; *kuḥlu* “kohl”; ’*a-kḥalu* “with black eyes”; *kuḥailu* “tar, coal tar”; *kuḥlī* “navy-blue”, *kaḥala* “to paint the eyes with kohl”. For Heb. *kāḥal*, see OT, 457.

### 3.3.55 Proto-IE-HS word [kah-l-] “back”

IE: OIr. *cūl* “back, back of the head”, NIr. *cūl* id.

HS: CA *kahilu* “upper part of the back”: BAram. *khl* “be able” (OT, 449).

### 3.3.56 Proto-IE-HS stem [luk-] “to kindle”

IE: Hitt. *lik-* “to kindle”, Skt. *ruc-* “to shine”.

HS: Egyp. *rk* “to kindle”, Ag., Bil. *laga* “fire”, CA *lukku* “red dye”. Ibn Barri (see LA) stresses that this kind of ‘dye’ can only be called *lukku* if it is cooked on fire.

### 3.3.57 Proto-IE-HS dial [kaz-] “to bite”, perh. fr. earlier [kaθ-] or more likely [kaḍ-]

IE: Lith. *kasti* “to bite”, Latv. *kuost* id., OCS. *kasati*, Russ. *kusat* id.

HS: CA words *kazama* “to bite severely” and *kadama* “to bite” seem to be variants of one form.

### 3.3.58 Proto-IE-HS dial. word [vb maks-] “to mix”, n. [mikās-] “mixture”

IE: Skt. *mikṣ-* “to mix”, OCS *mešiti* id., by metathesis: Lat. *miscēre* “to mix”, Grk *mísgō*, OHG. *miskan*, OIr. *mescaim*, Br. *meski* id.: PIE \**miks-*, etc. WP. II, 244ff; CCG: §25.2; IECD, 768; SS: §5.17; IEV, 268; DRLE, 127.

HS: Egyp. *mkd* “to mix”, Ga. *maka* id., by metathesis: Ug. *msk* “to mix” (UG, 534), Phoen. *msk* “mixer” (PG, 120), OffAram. *mzg* id. (NWSI II, 608), Heb. *māsak* “to mingle, mix”, BAram. *mzg* id. (OT, 551), CA *mizāḡu* “mixture”, as a verb: ’*a-mziḡu* “I mix, mingle”.

There is ample evidence, basically derived esp. from CA, Grk, and Lith. strongly suggesting that Proto-IE-HS [maks-] is a later form of an earlier [maig-]: cf. both CA and Grk have /g/ rather than /k/ and, in addition, Grk /ō/ is a reflex of either a laryngeal or semivowel. This original root is preserved intact in CA *maiḡu* “mingling together, mixing”, Grk *meignumi* “to mix”, Lith. *meišyti* id.

CA muġaġu “drunk, drunkard”; muġaġu “juice (of grapes)”: maġmaġa “to mix badly” are fr. [myg], where /y/ assimilates completely to the following /g/. A similar form is seen in Grm., but with an infixed -n-: cf. OE. *mengan* “to mix”, MLG., Du. *mengen* id.

**3.3.59** Proto-IE-HS word [rak- ~ raq-] “to utter, say, or recite words of power”.

IE: OIr. *reccaim* “to recite”, Toch. A *rake*, B. *reki* “speech, words”, OCS. *rešti* “to say, speak” also *reka* id, Lith. *rėkti* “to shout”, Latv. *rēkt* “to howl, bellow”: PIE \*rek-, rok-. IECD, 1070; SS: 18.22; WP. II, 362.

HS: Egyp. *rkʾ* “to bewitch, work magic on someone”, Sab. *rḳy* in *rḳt* “female magician” (SD, 117), CA *raḳā* “to recite words of power” ~ *rakka* “to speak incoherently; echo, noise”: *raḳā* “to echo”.

*Comments*

A near approximation to the orig. form has been preserved in CA *rakk-* and OIr. *recc-*. See §3.3.68 below.

**3.3.60** Proto-IE-HS stem [raky- ~ raqy-] “to adorn, estimate, reckon”, like so many other words with initial /ra-/, a cpd of proot [ra-], e.g. the same [ra-] in §3.3.59 above, and [ka- ~ qa-] (2.17.83 above).

IE: Skt. *rac-* (prob. fr. \*rac- = Grm. *h* = HS *ḳ*) “to form, fashion, adorn, prepare, arrange”, Goth. *rahnjan* “to reckon” in compounds “to estimate”. IECD, 1069, 1088; WP. II, 362; SS: §18.22.

HS: CA *rakaya*, *raḳā* “to fix, repair”, *rakka* “to touch a thing with the hand in order to estimate its size or weight”. It seems evident that CA had at one time a word \**raku* meaning “hand”.

Aram. *rḳy* “be agreeable, pleasant”, CA *raḳḳa* “to promote”, with n-ext. as in Grm.: *raḳana* “to adorn”, Pun. *rḳm* “to embroider” (NWSI II, 1084), with m-ext: *raḳḳama*, *raḳama* “to number”; *raḳmu* “number” = Goth. *rahn-* “to reckon”. See §2.15.24 above.

**3.3.61** Proto-IE-HS word [rakaʾ/-y-] “time”

IE: OCS. *rokû* “appointed time”, Cz, Pol. *rok* “time”, Bulg. *rok* “period, term”.

HS: Egyp. *rk* “time, period, age”, CA *raḳā* “to delay”.

**3.3.62** Proto-IE-HS word [rakd-] “to destroy”

IE: Ved. *rakṣah* “damage”, Av. *rašō-* “wounding”, Grk *erékhthō* “to break, burst”, Lith. *rakt* “to dig, poke”, Latv. *rakti* “to pluck”. IECD, 1070; SS: §9.26.

HS: Egyp. *rkt* “to destroy”, CA *rakaḏa* “to strike, beat”, Ga. *rukutu* “to strike, beat, hit”.

**3.3.63** Proto-IE-HS word [kan-] “to cover, shade; sky”

IE: Skt. *skunati* “covers”, Grk *skiē*, *skiā* “shade”, *skēnē* “tent”, Dor. *skāvá* id., Toch. B *skiyo* “shade”, OIr. *scaile* id., ON. *skugge* id., OHG. *skūr* “protection”: PIE \*sku-, skeu-, etc. SS: §§1.63, 12.26; WP. II, 535ff, 559; IECD: 1157f, 1191, 1202; IER, 60.

HS: Egyp. sk “to cover”, CA sakku “covering with iron”, Heb. sākak “to cover, shelter; hut, shelter” (OT, 721-722), Phoen. sk-t “tent” (Bustani, 1985: 82), Ug. sk “garment” (UG, 533). See §2.11.91 above.

Some related words are:

3.3.62a IE: ON. ský “sky”, Dan. sky id., OS. scio “sky, cloud, cover”, OE. scēo “cloud”, Arm. ču “ceiling, roof”.

HS: CA sukāku “sky, space” also “air”, Housa iskaa “air, wind” (Parsons, 1975: 427).

### 3.3.64 Proto-IE-HS word [šak-] “to cut”

IE: Lat. sacāre “to cut”, Umb. pro-sekatu “let him cut”, ON. sax “knife”, OHG. saga “saw”, OCS. sêšti, sêkati “to cut”, Cz. sekati id.: PIE \*sek-. IECD, 1123; SS: §9.22; WP. II, 474ff; IER, 56; DRLE, 183; IEV, 279.

HS: Egyp. sksk “to cut down”, CA sakka “to cut (usu. the ear)”, Ga. soka “to chop, carve”.

With n-ext.: Egyp. skn “to split, cleave” and with r-ext. “to cut”.

Related words are:

3.3.64a IE: Lat. secula “sickle”, securis “ax”, OCS. and common Sl. sêkyra id.

HS: Akk. šukurru “sword, lance, weapon” (AG, 106), CA šikālu, šinkālu “hook”, Meh. škl “sword”, Soq. škō id., Kaf. šikko “knife, dagger”, Tna. šəkal “peg”, Amh., Arg., Go., A. čəkal, Har. čəxal id. (HED, 49).

3.3.64b IE: (Lat. sacēna, scēna “chopper, axe” obviously a loan fr. Sem.), OSax. segisna “sickle, scythe”, OHG. segansa id., etc. IECD, 1136.

HS: CA sikkīnu, OffAram. škyn “knife” (NWSI II, 785), Egyp. skn above.

### 3.3.65 Proto-IE-HS word [šakar-] “be grateful (to a deity)”

IE: Hitt. sakalis “rite”, Toch. sakār “eminent, worthy”, Lat. sacer “pure”, later “holy”, Osc. sacrim acc. sg. “sacrificial, dedicated”. IECD, 1108.

HS: Palm. škr “to reward; rewarding, *used as a divine epithet*”, OffAram. škr “reward, salary” (NWSI II, 1135), Nab. škr “to praise, thank”, CA šakara “to praise, thank”, Sab. škr “be placated (deity)” (SD, 125), SA škr “be grateful”, Ug. škr “reward, favor”, Heb. šakar (Shehadeh, 1968: 55).

### 3.3.66 Proto-IE-HS word [sakai-p/b-] “ship”

IE: Goth., ON. skip “ship”, OE. scip, OHG. scif id.: ON. skipa “to divide, arrange”, Latv. šķ’ibit “to cut, hew”.

HS: perh. Egyp. skwt, pl., “ship”, Pun. šky “ship” (NWSI II, 1133).

### 3.3.67 Proto-IE-HS word [sukal-] “servant”

IE: sclavus “slave”, Goth. skalks, OHG. scalc id.

HS: Assy. sukkal “servant”.

**3.3.68** Proto-IE-HS stem [wak-] “to say” ~ [wak̂-] id. (cf. Skt. *vāce* “scream”, Oss. *wasîn* “to cry”; CA *waḵwaḵa-tu* fem. “noise; talkative”, etc.) ~ [waš-] (cf. CA *wašša*, *wašwaša* “to whisper”, Egyp. *wš* “to cry out”, etc.). These are not of imitative origin as some assume; they are ultimately from a form [KaW-], often seen as either [kaW-], [qaW-]. To this proot one can add [wa-], [ra-], [ša-] (§3.3.59 above & §§3.3.69, 3.3.70 below), etc. When we get to this *deepest* level of analysis, we will certainly find that all phonetic differences between /k, q, g/ are neutralized (for [gaW-], see §2.11.58 above).

IE: Skt. *vac-* “to speak, say”, Toch. B *wek-* “to say, speak”, Lat. *vocāre* “to call”; *vōx* “voice”, Hitt. *wekuwar* “request”: PIE \**wek-(wo-)*, *wōk-*, etc. SS: §18.21; WP. I, 245; IECD, 1515, 1577.

HS: Egyp. *yky* “to cry out”, *ykk* “song, cry”, CA *wakwaka* “to coo”.

**3.3.69** Proto-IE-HS stem [kaW-] “to think, to see”.

IE: Skt. *kavi-* “wise, seer”, Grk *koéw* “to notice”, Lat. *cavēre* “to take care, watch over”, OHG. *scouwēn* “to regard”.

HS: Egyp. *k'* “to think, think out, mediate”.

**3.3.70** Proto-IE-HS word [sakaW-] “to say”, fr. the same proot as those in §3.2.59 and §3.2.68 above.

IE: Lith. *seku*, *saku* “to say”, OCS. *sociter* “to indicate”, OHG. *sagen* “to say”. IEV, 279.

HS: CA *šakā* “to complain”, n. *šakwā*, Pun. *šky* “to implore” (NWSI II, 1133), Som. *šēgy* “saying” (Castellino, 1975: 338).

**3.3.71** Proto-IE-HS word [sa-kap-] “to cover with clothes”.

IE: Grk *skepas*, fr. caus. *sa-* plus stem *-kepas* “to cover”: Lith. *kepurė* “cap”, Latv. *cepure* id., Cz. *čepice* id. SS: §6.55; WP. II, 559.

HS: CA pre-Islamic *kafara* “to cover, hide”, Heb. *kāpar* id. (OT, 485), Sab. *kfr* “covered cistern” (SD, 77), Liḥ. Nab. *kpr* “tomb” fr. “to bury; cover” (NWSI I, 531), with n-ext.: CA *kaffana* “to envelop in a shroud, dress for the grave”, etc., Egyp. *k'p* “to cover with clothes”, *kpy* “cloud”, Shil. *kfu* “coffin”, etc.

MLat. *cofea* “hood” is borrowed from Grm. (SS: §6.41, §6.55): cf. OHG. *chuppha* “head-covering used under helmet”, which is ultimately from CA *kūffiyya-tu* fem. “head covering”: Amh. *kāfay*, *kafay* “a kind of fine cloth”, Har. *kafāwi* “a kind of cloth”, Tna. *kāfäy* “a kind of silken shirt” (HED, 91).

**3.3.72** Proto-IE-HS word [ʼank-] “I”

IE: Hitt. nom. sg. *ūk* “I”, acc.-dat. *ammuk*, Grk *egō*, Lat. *ego* id., Faliscan *eko*, *eco* “I”, OLith. *eš* id., OCS *azū*, Goth. *ik*, acc. *mik*, OE *ic* id. IECD, 236, 233; DRLE, 45.

HS: Akk. *anāku* “I”, Ug. *ank* id, Egyp. *ynwk(i)* id., *ynwk-ḥw* “I myself”. *This form is without -nk* = Egyp. *y* “I”, Sem. *'a-* as in CA *'a-ktubu* “I write”, etc. and *without -k* = CA *'anā*, Ug. *an*, Eth. *ana* “I”, etc. It is this [ʼ-: nom. -ʼu, acc. -ʼa] that appears in Lat. *fer-ō* (fr. \**fer-ʼu*), Goth. *bair-a* (fr. *bair-ʼu*) “I bear”: see my analysis of HS pers. pronouns in §2.22.2 above.

### Comments

a) The same suffix /-k/ is also seen in Hitt. nom. zik “thou”, acc.-dat. tuk (fr. tu “thou” + -k), Goth. acc. þuk, fr. þu “thou” + -k, acc.-dat. dual ugkis “we two”, acc.-dat. dual igqis “you two” = Egypt. ntk 2<sup>nd</sup> masc. “thou, thee”.

b) The function of the suffix in Sem. involves only ‘the person(s) spoken to’, e.g.

CA *sa’ala-ka* “he asked you”, etc.; *kitābu-ka* masc. “your book”, fem. *kitābu-ki*, etc.

It is only in Akk. and Eth. that the suffix has also been extended to 1<sup>st</sup> pers. sg. preterit: Akk. *ḫabrā-ku*, Eth. *ḫabar-kū* = CA *ḫabar-tu* “I buried”.

c) Available evidence tells that the oldest function of ‘a suffix -k’ was a proot designating “male” as opposed to [-θ] “female”, and it often appears in HS as /-k/, /-š/, /-g/ and sometimes /-ḫ/. This is the same proot seen in CA *dī-ku* “rooster”, *naz-ku* “penis of some animals”, etc. see §2.23.9 above. The ‘k-θ contrast’ is also seen in Egypt. suffixed masc. -k, fem. -θ “thou, thee, thy” in the independent masc. ntk “thou”, fem. ntθ.

d) Initial /m-/ in IE acc. forms as in Skt. *mām*, Lat. *mē*, Goth. *mik*, Grk *emé*, OCS. *mene*, etc. “thee” corresponds to Egypt. m-ntk “thee”, where the /m-/ is orig. a prep. See §3.19.2.7, esp. *Comments* I and II below.

### 3.3.73 Proto-IE-HS word [kaišum-] “small plant”

IE: Skt. *kusuma-* “flower”.

HS: Assy. *kiššēnu* “plant, vetch”, CA *kaisumu* “plant, grass”; *’uksūmu* “fresh herb or grass”.

### 3.3.74 Proto-IE-HS [sikθ- or siqθ-] “six”

IE: Ved. *ṣaṣ-* “six”, Lith. *šeši* id., Av. *xšvaš-* id.

HS: Egypt. *sys* “six”, *srs* “six-ply stuff”, OAram., EHeb., Pun. *šš* “six”, CA fem. *sittu*, masc. *sitta-tu* “six”; *sāttan* ~ *sādiyan* “sixth”, *sādisan* id., (comp. *hāmisan* ~ *hamiyan* “fifth”, etc.).

Sem. /-š/ of [šš] appears in CA only in the ordinal number as /-d-/ but never /-t-/ in masc. nom. *sādisu* “sixth”, fem. *sādisa-tu*. Comparison of CA and HS words above reveals that CA 2<sup>nd</sup> /-t-/ of *sittu* can *never* be from /-š/. In accordance with this indisputable fact, this CA /-t-/ and final /-s/ of *sādis* “sixth” are from an earlier /-θ/, which regularly appears in Aram. dialects as /-t/: comp. OffAram., Palm., Nab., JAram. *št* “six”, etc.

Comparison of CA *sitt-* and OAram, Heb. *šš* reveals a striking and unusual difference; while CA /s-/ here = is from Sem. *š-*, its 1<sup>st</sup> /-t-/ can never be from Sem. 2<sup>nd</sup> /-š/. This plainly tells that CA 1<sup>st</sup> /-t-/ of *sitt-* and /-d-/ of *sādis*, along with Sem. 2<sup>nd</sup> /-š/, are from a consonant phonetically different from all of them. It is most likely that the CA form was originally \*sikθu or \*siqθu “sixth”.

### 3.4 *PROTO-IE-HS /g/*

Proto-IE-HS /g/ is a voiced velar stop. It is in IE /g/ (> \*g, \*gh, \*ĝ, g<sup>w</sup>) and in HS /g/.

#### 3.4.1 Proto-IE-HS stem [gab-] “to seize

IE: Lat. *habere* “to seize, catch”, Osc. *haffieist* 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. “shall have”, Umbr. *haf-* “to seize”, Ir. *gaibim* “to take, seize”, Corn. *avel* “to take hold”, W. *gafaele id.*, Goth. *giban* “to give”, OHG. *geban*, OE. *giefan id.*: PIE \*ghabh-. CCG: §34.2; SS: §11.21; IECD, 309; WP. I, 344; IER, 20.

HS: Egypt. *gyb* “to seize, catch”, CA *ġabā* “to collect taxes”; ’i-*ġataba* “to choose for oneself”, Mand. *gba* “to gather, choose”; *gabia* “collector of dues”, Syr. *gebā* “to choose, elect”, Telm. *gabbāyā*, Heb. *gabbāy* “collector”, etc. (DRS II, 93; MD, 73, 79), OffAram., Palm. *gby* “to levy, collect”, Hatra *gb* “stealing” (NWSI I, 207-208), Sab. *gyb* “to defend, protect” (SD, 51), Ga. *guba* “offering, bribe”, Som. *gābbati* “a gift given by the bridegroom to the relative of the bride”, Har. *gābātti* “a kind of gift” (HED, 67).

#### 3.4.2 Proto-IE-HS stem [gab-] “to collapse”

IE: OCS. *gybati* “to perish”; po-*gubiti* “to destroy”, Russ. *gubit’* “to spoil”, Latv. *gubt* “subside; collapse”.

HS: Egypt. *gb* “to collapse”; *gbgb* “to overthrow”, CA *ġabba* “to extirpate”, Sab. *gb’* “to retire, give in”; st-*gb’* “reduce to submission” (SD, 48), Eth.: Te. *gābbā* “become poor”; *gāb belā* “be hungry” (DRS II, 94), Som. *jab* “to break”, G. *gabada* “to spoil”.

#### 3.4.3 Proto-IE-HS word [gabal-] “top, summit”, fr. an ext. of [gab-]

IE: Gallo-Lat. *gabalus*, *gabalum* “gallows”, Ir. *gabul*, *gabal* “pillar, beam, fork”, W. *gafl* “fork”, Toch. *špāl* “head”, Grk *kephalē* “head, front”, Goth. *gibla* “gable”, OHG. *gebal* “head, skull, gable”. IECD, 315f; SS: §4.20; CCG: §34.2; IEV, 99; WP. I. 533; IER, 21.

HS: CA *ġabalu* “mountain”, OSA *gblt* “mountainous region”, OAram. *gbl*, Heb. *gebūl* “frontier, boundary”.

All words above are from stem [gab] as in Akk. *gabū* “top, summit”, Heb. *gab* “height”, Jp. *gibebā* “summit”, Ga. *guba* “top, summit”.

With different exts: Chad.: Housa *gabā* “physical front of a person”, Ngizim bo-*gaba*, Dwot *gupe* “breast, chest”, CA *ġabha-tu* “forehead, front”, BHeb. *gabaha-t* “bald forehead”; with n-ext.: *gabīnu* “forehead”, Talm. *gbn* “crown of the head, summit”, Syr. *gbn* “arc of the eye-brow”, Heb. *gbn* “summit”, etc. §2.1.9.2 above.

#### 3.4.4 Proto-IE-HS \*gad- “fortune, capable”

IE: OCS. *goditi* “be suitable”, OHG. *gigat* “fitting”, OFris. *gedda* “to fit, suit”, Latv. *gadities* “chance to be”; OCS. *godu* “hour, time”, Cz. *hodina* “hour”, Lith. *gadyne*



“period”; Goth. gadi-liggs “kinsman”, OE. gada “company”, etc. PIE \*ghadh-, \*ghodh-. IECD, 327; SS: §14.11; WP. I, 531f.

HS: CA ḡadda “be lucky, diligent, serious, successful”; ḡaddu “fortune, luck, chance”, OffAram., Palm, Hatra, Pun. gd “fortune, chance, luck”, Heb. gad “luck, fortune, success”, Tna. gaddi, Te. gad “fortune, chance” (NWSI II, 212; DRS II, 100), Mand. gad “fortune, luck, success”; gadana “fortune, lucky” (MD, 73).

For OCS. godu, etc. above: CA ḡadā in a fixed expression “end, last”.

For Goth. gadi(liggs), etc. above: CA ḡaddu “grandfather, ancestor”, Mand. guda “company, group, band” (MD, 83), Cush.: Bmb gada “aged group, generation”, Alagwa gad-mo, Burunge gadu-wa “old man”, Chad.: Kwang gāḏ-atē, Ngizim gaḏe “old” (HSED, n. 196).

**3.4.5** Proto-IE-HS word [gud-r] “competent, clever”, fr. an ext. of [gad-] “be capable” above.

IE: Lith. gudras, gudrus “clever, crafty”, Lat. gudrus “wise”, Hitt. kutruwas “witness”.

HS: CA ḡadura “be worthy of, deserving”; ḡadiru, pl. ḡadarā’u, “competent, efficient, capable”, Heb. hit-gaddēr “to excell, be distinguished”, Har. gidra “social rank, respect”, gādāra “become great”, Te. gadər “strong”, Z. giddir, S., W. gidir “big”, etc. (HED, 69), Berb. agadir “strong” (Cohen II, 108).

**3.4.6** Proto-IE-HS stem [gud-] “God” is fr. the same word in CA gaddu “fortune, richness, luck, chance”.

IE: Goth. guda, pl., “god”, OE. god, OHG. got, ON, goṑ, guṑ id., connected with Skt *huvate*, etc. “calls”. SS: §22.12, etc. For the Skt. word, see §2.11.58 above.

HS: Egyp. gyd “god”, Phoen. gd “*Gad*, god of Fortune” (PG, 93), Heb. gād “*Gad*, i.e. *god of Fortune*”, was worshipped by *the Babylonians and the Jewish exiles* (OT, 177), Babyl. Gadd, Gidd “god of fortune”. In CA ḡaddu occurs in the Koran in the sense of “greatness or majesty of God” (و انه تعالى جد ر بنا) and also in *Hadith* (of supplication or prayer) «*tabāraka ’ismu-ka wa ta’ālā ḡaddu-ka*» (LA). It is to be noted, however, that the word has never been used in addressing a *king, Amir, or president*. Sab. gdd “great”; h-gdd “magnify, glorify” (DRS II, 100).

To [gad-] “god” *may* also belong OIr. *guidim* “to pray, ask, beg”; fui-*gde* “begging”: CA ḡadā “to beg, ask for” also “to give, grant”, Sab. h-gd “make a grant (of land)” (SD, 49).

#### Comments

It seems that [gad] is a compound of two proots [ga’] and [wud], and that the earliest compound is seen in CA ḡāda [ḡwd] “to grant, give”, ḡūdu “generosity”; ḡaiyid “excellent, good”. For [ga’], see §2.17.83 above, and for [wud], see §2.12.17 above, bearing in mind that *wud* = Grm. *woden* in modern English *Wedne-s-day* (< OE. *woden* “god of war”).

**3.4.7** Proto-IE-HS stem [gal-], with numerous exts, esp. in IE, “to shine”.

With ei- (or y-) ext.: ON. glaja “to shine, glow”, OIr. gle “clear, bright”, W. gloew id., etc.

With eu-ext.: Corn. glew “bright”, Grk khleúē “joke”, etc.

With s-ext.: OE. glisnian “to glisten”, OFris. glisia, etc.

With st-ext.: Latv. glīts “neat, clean”, Ir. gleas “brilliance”, etc.

With d-ext.: Goth. glitmunjan “to shine”, ON. glīta, etc.

With dh-ext.: OCS. gladûkû “smooth, level”, Lith. glodus “smooth”, OE. glæd “bright, glad”, etc.

With ndh-ext.: OHG. glanz “shining”, OIr. glinnim “to clarify”, OBr. gloiu id., etc. all are fr. PIE \*gel-. IECD, 322ff; WP. I, 624ff; SS: §15.65; IER, 18f.

HS: CA ḡalā, ḡalaya “to elucidate, make clear, shine”; ḡaliyyu “apparent, evident, visible”; ḡa-ḡlā “show, uncover”; ḡalwā’u “shining”, Phoen., OffAram., JAram. gly “to uncover, reveal”, gly “to uncover, reveal” (NWSI I: 223), Heb. ḡālā “to uncover; reveal; be manifested, discovered, to come to light” (OT, 193), Mand. gla “to uncover, reveal, unveil”; gliuta “clarity” (MD, 76), Syr. galyotā “clarity, transparency”, Ge. gelyat “explanation”, Amh. gala “be clear” (DRS III: 120).

With various exts: Mand. galil “to reveal”, ṯgalal “become manifest”, Som. gili’san “soft, easy”, CA ḡala’a “to uncover, make obvious”, ḡalata “to shave”, Heb. gilla’ “to uncover, reveal”, with h-ext.: Aram. Jp. gilhē “clearness, brightness of the sky”, CA ḡalaha “to uncover”, Tna. gelhi, Gour. gällä “be clear, obvious”, etc. (DRS III, 125f, 131).

To the stem [gal-] also belong Lith., Latv. galva “head”, OCS. and common Sl. galva id. = CA ḡalā, as vb “to shine”, as n. “bald-headed”; ma-ḡālī “front of the head where ‘baldness’ first appears”, Heb. ḡālāh “be naked”, etc. see §2.1.10, n. 5 above.

### 3.4.8 Proto-IE-HS stem [gul-] “sphere, ball”

IE: Skt. gola- “ball, sphere”, Lat. globus “sphere”. IECD, 279, 282; SS: §12.83; WP. I. 615.

HS: OAram. glgl “wheel”, Syr. gloltā, Mand. galgla, Jp galgal “ball, globe”, Heb. galgal “wheel”, Pun. glgl “wheel”, Samal glgl id. (NWSI I, 222; DRS II, 118; III, 125), Phoen. glgl id. (PG: 94), CA ḡulḡulu “bell”, *so-called from its round shape*, Akk. gullatum “ball”, Chad.: Housa gulūlu “ball”, Logone ngolō “round” (HSED, n. 948, 980).

Related words are:

3.4.8a IE: ON. klettr “rock, cliff”, etc. fr. \*gel- in words denoting “spherical shape”, according to Buck (SS: §1.50)

HS: Akk. galāl- “pebble, boulder”, Mand. glala “stone, rock”, Palm. glī’, Jp. gelāl “stone”, BHeb. gal “heap of stones” (DRS III, 126; NWSI I, 224; OT, 194).

### 3.4.9 Proto-IE-HS stem [gal-] “be ill with”

IE: Lith. gelty “cause violent pain”; galas “end”, OPruss. gallan “death”, OE. cwellan “to die”, Ir. at-balim id., W. aballu “to perish”.

HS: Akk. gillatu, gellatu “crime, sin, bad action”: gullulu “to commit sin”, Te. golāli ga’a “to suffer, be sick, lose strength”; gele “feeble, miserable”; Amh. agolala “to

damage, injure, make ill”, (DRS III, 125, 126). Here also belong Akk. *galgaltu*, *galgallatu*, *kalkaltu* “hunger”, Cush.: *gaargale* “famine” (HSED, n. 885; DRS II, 118).

#### Comments

One should have noted *by now* that not only HS languages have ‘*doubled roots*’, but also IE languages have them. For ‘*doubled roots*’, see § 2.1.7.1 above, and for additional examples, see §§3.2.12-3.2.14, 3.3.5, 3.3.24b, 3.3.25, above & 3.4.12, 3.5.19, 3.9.27, 3.10.18, 3.10.21, 3.11.2, 3.11.27, 3.14.3, 3.14.19, 3.14.29, 3.14.32, 3.14.35, 3.14.40, etc. below.

On the other hand, doubling the medial radical of a trilateral root is always associated with well-defined grammatical functions in HS, esp. in Akk. and CA (see §2.1.7.3 above). Apart from *causative* and *intensive meanings* (n., vb, adj.) expressed by doubling the second radical, and apart from the formation of agent nouns, a word like CA *kallama* “to speak to, talk to” (= Hitt. *kalles-* “to call, invite”: §3.3.5 above) cannot express this meaning without doubling /-l-/. The word with one /-l-/: ‘*kalama*’- as it stands- expresses “to wound, injure” and has nothing to do with “*speaking*”.

**3.4.10** Proto-IE-HS word [galb-/p-] “to sculpture, carve”. It is needless to say that /-l-/ is an infix.

IE: Grk *gláphō* “to carve, shape, cut”, Cz. *z-hlobiti* “to carve, shape”, Bulg. *glob* “hollow of eye”: PIE: *gelebh-*. WP. I, 630.

HS: OffAram., Pal. *glp* “to sculpture, sculpt”, Hatra. *glp* “to sculpture”, Syr., Jp. *glp* id., Ge. *galafa* id.; *galfō* “sculpture, statue, idol”, Te. *gālfā* “to hew, cut with an ax”, Amh. *gālāffāfā* “to peel”, CA *ġalafa* “to scrape, peel, cut” (DRS III, 132), Mand. *glp* “to form, fashion, engrave” (MD, 94).

**3.4.11** Proto-IE-HS stem [gal-] “to utter, make noise, speak”

IE: OCS. *glagolati* “to speak”, *glagolŭ* “word”, *glasus* “voice”, Lith. *galsas* “echo”, OE. *callian* “to call”, ON. *kalla* “to shout, call”, MBr. *galu* “to call”. SS: §18.41; WP. I, 538; IECD, 263f, 266.

HS: CA *ġalġala* expresses very *intensive meaning* “to resound, roar, make noise”; mu-*ġalġalu* “speaker of the tribe; having a loud voice”, Syr. *galgaltā* “noise”, Shil. *gal* “to swear” (Applegate, 1958: 52).

With g-ext.: IE: Ir. *glag* “noise”, *glagraim* “to chatter, resound”, *glamaim* “to roar”, ON. *klaka* “to chatter”, Grk *glazō* “to resound” = HS: Talm. *gallēg* “to announce”, etc. see below.

Also belong here: IE: Skt. *garh-* “to blame”, OHG. *klagōn* “to complain” = HS: CA *ġaliġu* “be perplexed, disturbed, troubled”: see §2.11.58 above.

#### Comments

One should note that many of the originally redupl. words have been preserved in IE and HS. Some of the examples we have seen so far are §§3.2.8, 3.3.21, 3.3.24-26, 3.3.50, and 3.3.53. For reduplication in IE-HS, see §3.19.3.1b below.

#### 3.4.12 Proto-IE-HS stem [gul-] “bowl, basin”

IE: Hitt. *gallit* “bowl, basin”, Lat. *galea* “helmet”.

HS: Akk. *gullu*, *gulla-tu* “basin” also “bowl”, Ug. *gl* “cup, goblet”, Heb. *gullā id.*, CA *ġulla-tu* “container, large vessel”, Chad.: Musgum *gulai* “straw basket” (DRS III, 125; HSED, n. 979).

HS words above are certainly cognate with Hitt. *gallit*, but not with Lat. *galea*, which seems to be from a form with final laryngeal or semivowel. There are two possibilities:

A less likely supposition is that Lat. *galea* is ultimately from \*gal-, but with a different ext., i.e. \*-w/-y: Heb. *gulā* “bowl, reservoir” (OT, 193), Amh. *gäläy* “basin, goblet”, etc.

A more likely supposition is that Lat. *galea* is borrowed from Egyp. *glí* “headdress, wig”. The Egyp. word comes directly from \*gal-l-. Its final /-i/ is either from \*/l/ or a long vowel. The long vowel is seen in CA *ġilālu* “a cover”, Syr. *gelīlta*, *gallā* “a cover”.

#### 3.4.13 Proto-IE-HS stem [gal-] “master, majesty; might”

IE: Grk *khal-epós* “hard”, *khal-kós* “strong”, OIr. *gal* “bravery”, W. *gall*, Br. *gall*, *gell* “able, can”, Cor. *gallos* “might”, Lith. *galēti* “be able”, *galia* “might”: PIE: \*gal-, \*ghal-. SS: §9.95; IECD, 311f; WP. I, 539; IER, 18.

HS: Assy. *gugallu* “ruler, director” (King, 1898: 341), CA *ġalālu* “greatness, magesty”; mu-*ġallilu* “strong, bold”: *ġalla*, *ġallala* “be or become great, dignified, honorable, mighty, etc., to revere, honor, etc.”, Te. *gällälä* “to honor, venerate, feel reverence for” (DRS III, 126), Aram. *gll* “strong man, master”.

#### 3.4.14 Proto-IE-HS stem [gul-] “side, edge (of valley, of sea)”

IE: OIr. *glenn* “valley”, Ir. *glean*, W. *glyn id.*: W. *glan* “side, shore, bank”, Br. *glann* “bank”, LG., Dan. *klint* “cliff”. SS: §1.24. Also belong here Latv. *dzelme* “depth”, Lith. *gelme id.*, *gilus* “deep”, W. *glan* “side, bank, shore”, Br. *glann* “bank”.

HS: Heb. \*gal “embankment, bank” (DRS III, 126), Som. *gol* “slope”, Ga. *gola* “bottom”, CA *ta-ġalġala lit.* “sink down into the bottom of the earth”.

With various exts: CA *ġalha-tu fem.* “side of a valley”; *ġulha-tu* “valley”; *ġulhtāni*, dual, “two sides of a valley”; *ġulhumu* “edge, side (of a valley)”, *ġulāhu* “deep valley”.

#### 3.4.15 Proto-IE-HS stem [gam-] “to come, approach”

IE: Skt., Av., OPers. *gam-* “to come, go”, Skt. *abhi-gam-* “to approach”, Goth. and common Germ. *qiman* “to come”, Toch. *kām- id.* IECD, 354; SS: §10.47; WP. I, 657ff; IEV, 259.

HS: Egyp. *gmgm* “to approach”, CA *ġamma*, CIV *’aġamma id.*

3.4.16 Proto-IE-HS word [gam-’-] “to unite, capulate”, fr. an ext. of \*gam- seen in words with a basic semantic notion “to unite, assemble” as well as “be full” as in CA *ġamma* “to unite, assemble” also “fill to the brim”, Heb. *gam* “to assemble”, Pun. *gm* “totality”, etc. (DRS III, 141), CA *ġammu id.* also “very numerous, multitude”; *ġamāmu* “full”, Ga. *guma* “to assemble”, Chad.: Sura *gam*, *kum* “be full, to fill”, Angas, Ankwe *gam*, Montol *gum*, Bolewa *gom*, Pero *kem id.* (HSED, n. 888). For Housa *gamu* “meet

together”, Angas gwom, Bolewa gom, Krk gam, Tangale komb-, Bade gam- id. (HSED, n. 952): cf. CA *ġamma* “to come together so as to become many or numerous”.

IE: Grk *gaméō* “to marry”; *gámos* “marriage”; *gémō* “be full”, Lith. *gimdyti* “to beget, bear”; *gimtis* “family” also “sex”, etc. SS: §4.71.

HS: CA *ġama’a* “to unite, capulate”; *ġāma’a* “to have sexual intercourse”; *muġāma’a-tu* “sex”; *muġtama’u* “community, society”; *ġam’u* “crowd”; *ġamī’u* “all, entire”, Sab. *gm’*, Meh. *gatma’*, Shh. *gotma’* “to unite, assemble”, Te. *tegämme’a* “be together” (DRS III, 143).

### 3.4.17 Proto-IE-HS stem [gam-] “to pant”

IE: Lat. *gemere* “to groan”, Arm. *cmam* “to sigh”, OIr. *geamh* “prattle”. IECD, 390; SS: 8.46.

HS: Egyp. *gmgm* “to pant, breathe with difficulty”, CA *ġamġama* “to speak incoherently”, Te. *gomāmā* “be sad”, Amh. *gəm alā* “to growl”. See §2.11.58, n. 1.

### 3.4.18 Proto-IE-HS stem [gum-] “man”, a cpd of [gu-] (see §2.17.83 above) and [maW] (see §2.17.61 above).

IE: Goth. and common Germ. *guma* id., Lat. *homō* “human being”, Osc. *humuns*, pl., id., OLith. *žmuo* “man, husband”: PIE *\*ghom-*. IECD, 420f; SS: §2.20; IEV, 48.

HS: Egyp. *gmwt* “a group of gods”, CA *ġuma’u* expresses, according to one account, “person”, and to another “the person you see through a transparent material (e.g. clothes)”, Ga. *komo* “kinsman”, with n-ext.: Har. *gumna* “person leading a promiscuous life” is from Ga. *gumna* “person”, according to Leslau (HED, 72). Also belong here CA *ġimmu* (fr. *\*ġummu*) “lower people” and *ġumhūru* “masses, people”, etc.

### 3.4.19 Proto-IE-HS stem [gum-] “hair”

IE: Lat. *coma* “hair”, Grk *kōmē* id.

HS: CA *ġumma-tu* “head hair”, Har. *gāmma* “mane”, Amh., Tna., A., Z., Gour. *gamma*, W. *gamme*, etc. Cush.: Ga., Sid. *gamma*, Som., Sa., Af. *gama* id. (HED, 72; DRS III, 141-142), PChad. *\*gm-* “beard” (Carnochan, 1075: 462), Egyp. *gemeš*, *gmḥ* “hair”.

### 3.4.20 Proto-IE-HS stem [gan-] “be born, about to be born”

IE: Skt. *janami* “be born”, Grk *genno* “to beget, gignomai”, Dor., Ion. *geinomai* “be born”, OLat. *genere* “to beget”, W. *geni* “be born, give birth”, Ir. *gein* “birth”, Br. *genel* “give birth”, Arm. *cnam* “to give birth”: PIE *\*gen-*. SS: §4.71; IECD, 390ff; WP. I, 576ff; CCG: §§34.2, 8.2; Meillet, *Introd.* 131; IER, 19; DRLE, 256.

HS: CA *ġanīnu* “fetus”, i.e. *about to be born* = Egyp. *kns* “the placenta, the *after birth*”, Ge. *ganin* “fetus, infant (just born)”, Te. *gənā* id., etc.

Some derivatives of stem [gan-] are:

3.4.20a IE: Ved. *gnā-* “wife of God”, Skt. *jani-* “woman”, Grk *gunē* id., Goth. and common Germ. *qino* “woman, wife”, OIr. *ben*, Arm. *kin*, OCS. *žena* “woman”. IEV, 49.

HS: Egyp. knyt “goddess”, Ag. ganā “mother”, Kafa gen-ē “old woman”, Jan. genē, Log. gənəm “woman” id, etc. (Castillino, 1975: 335, 339, Müller, 1975: 64), Palm. gny “divine being”, Hatra. gnyt “female divine being” (NWSI I, 229-230), CA hāḡīnu “girl”, ḡinni-yyatu “woman, wife of jinn”, Mand. ginia “offerings to idols”, Akk. ginū (MD, 91). See §2.4.17 above.

3.4.20b IE: Skt. jan- “human being, race”, Lat. gens “tribe, race”, Grk genos id., OIr. gein “child, offspring”, gent “race”, Goth. kuni “race, family”, OE. cynn “kin”.

HS: CA ḡinnu “race, clan, tribe, family; son, offspring of jinn”, Ge. gānen, Te. Tna., Amh. ganen “jinn, demon, devil”, Te. gan “spirit of the dead”, etc. (DRS III, 147f): PHS \*gan-, seen with different exts:

a) with z-ext.: CA ganaza-tu “dead person”, Sab. gnz-t “dead body” also “assembly” (SD, 50),

b) with t-ext.: CA ḡintu “origin of Man as well as of anything” also “race” as a verb ta-ḡannata may be rendered “to present a false identification of one’s origin, i.e. *one’s family, tribe or race*”, etc. see below.

3.4.20c IE: OE. cnapa, cnafa “boy, servant”, OHG. knabo “boy”, knappe “boy, youth”, MHG. knabe “boy”, Du. knaap id.

HS: Egyp. gnmw (fr. \*gnbw) “servant”, OArm. gnb “bandit, thief” (NWSI I, 227-228), CA ḡanību “foreigner”.

3.4.20d IE: Lat gener “son-in-law”, Lith. zentas id., OCS. zeti “son- or brother-in-law”.

HS: Egyp. gnm’ “friend”: gnn “be gentle”, perh. orig. “of good birth” as Lat. gentilis.

### 3.4.21 Proto-IE-HS word [wiga-n-] “cheek, jaw, chin”

IE: Lat. gena “cheek”, Grk genus “jaw, chin”, Goth. kinnus, OE. cinn, ON. kinn “cheek”, W. gen “jaw, chin”, with d-ext.: Lith. žandas “jaw”, Grk gnáthos id. SS: §§4.207- 4.209; CCG: §72; WP. I, 587; IECD, 394f; IEV, 99; SOE: §219.

HS: Egyp. wgy-t “lower jaw”, Cop. ouge “cheek”, Chad.: Lamang goyo “chin, beard”, Zeghwana gwiye, Glv. Nakaci g<sup>w</sup>iya, Gava g<sup>w</sup>uya id. (HSED, n. 990), CA wuḡna-tu ~ ’uḡna-tu ~ wiḡna-tu “cheek”, Housa kunci “cheek”, Har. gunč “cheek”, Amh. gunč “chin”, Tna. gunči id., Ms., Go., A. gunčā, Arg. gumbeč, Sid. gaččo “chin and beard”, Ag., Bil. kumiš, “cheek”, etc. HED, 73.

Related words are:

3.4.21a IE: Latv. waigs “face”

HS: CA waḡhu id., Meh. wagh id., Jib. āgah “face”, Shh. āgh id. (DRS VI, 491), Berb.: Kab. ujh id., Cush.: Som. \*waaki, \*weeji “face” (RPAA, n. 958).

3.4.21b IE: OIr. gin, W. geneu, Br. genou, OCorn. genau “mouth”.

HS: CA waḡūru “middle of the mouth”.

3.4.21c IE: Grk *siāgōn* “jaw, cheek”, a compound of \**siā-* (?) and \**-gōn* “jaw”: see below. *Is Grk* \**siā-* = CA *zau* “two, pair”, i.e. *ḏau* id.? (§§2.17.22-23 above).

3.4.21d IE: Grk *génus* “axe”.

HS: CA *mī-ġana-tu* “mallet, beetle”, a direct derivative of *wiġna-tu* “cheek”.

### 3.4.22 Proto-IE-HS stem [gan-] “to strike, kill”

IE: Skt. *han-*, Av. *jan-* “to strike, kill”, OPers. *jan-* id., Hitt. *kun, kwen-* “to strike, kill, defeat”, OIr. *gonim* “to wound, kill”, Arm. *ganem* “to strike”, Oss. *qān* “wound”. HCG: §66; SS: §4.76; WP. I, 679f; IECD, 379f; Meillet, *Introd.* 63; IEV, 260; DRLE, 69; IER, 25.

HS: Akk. *genû* “to knock”, Syr. *gannī* “to injure”, Mand. *ganī* id., OffAram. *n-gn* “to injure”, (DRS III, 147-148; NWSI I, 229), CA *ġanā* “to commit a crime, harm, inflect, oppress”; *mi-ġannu* “shield”, Akk. *maginnu*, Ug. *mgn* id., etc. (DRS III: 147), CA *ġunna-tu* fem. “weapon” (= Skt. *hanma* id.), Phoen. *gnn* “to protect” (PG, 94), Heb. *gnn* id. (OT, 200).

Stem [gan-] is rich in derivatives, some of them are below.

3.4.22a IE: Lith. *gadinti* “to perish, spoil”, Skt. *gandh-* “to hurt, injure”, Lat. *sa-gandēt* id., Alb. *gand* “injury”, etc. IECD, 382.

HS: Egyp. *gnt* “wound”, CA *ġannada* “to levy troops”; *ġundu* “army, troops” (OHG. *gund-* “war”, OS. *gūþea* id., OE. *gūþ*, ON. *gunnar* id.), Hatra. *gndh, gdh* “army”, etc. (NWSI I, 212, 228).

The supposed CA cognate should terminate with /*ḏ*/ rather than /*d*/. However, a sequence /*ḡnd*/ is impermissible. It is most likely that *ġannaṣa* “be so much frightened” also “to die” is from \**ġannaḏa*.

3.4.22b IE: OCS. *gněvŭ* “anger”, Russ. *gnev* id., Cz. *hněv*, Pol. *gniew* id.

HS: Egyp. *gnt* “be angry”, Aram. *gnt* “to reprimand”.

### 3.4.23 Proto-IE-HS stem [gan-] “to reap”

IE: OCS. and common Sl. *žeti* “to reap”, Lith. *genėti* “to trim, prune”, etc. IECD, 380ff; SS: §8.32.

HS: CA *ġanā, ġanaya* “to reap”, *ganyu, ganā’u* “crop”, Sab. *gnn, gtnn* “to gather crop” (SD, 50), Ge. *gan’a* “to thresh” (DRS III, 147). Har. *gāna* “get, obtain, earn, find, gain”, Amh., N., Go., A. *agännän*, etc. (HED, 73).

Related words are below:

3.4.23a IE: Lith. *ganyti* “to pasture, graze”, etc. SS: §3.16; IECD, 380ff.

HS: CA *ġanaya* “to pasture, graze”, Sab. *’gnw* “cultivated garden area”, *gnt* “garden crop” (SD, 50), Ug., Aram., Phoen. *gn* “garden”, Akk. *gannatu* “protected garden”, CA *ġannatu* “garden”. DRS III, 147.

3.4.23b IE: Skt. *ghana-* “thick” as subs. “solid, mass”.

HS: Egyp. gn “heap, abundance”, CA muta-ġannina-tu fem., said of earth, “densely crowded with grass and plants”.

#### 3.4.24 Proto-IE-HS word [gar-ʼ] “rope”.

IE: Skt. guṇa- “rope”, «esp. *the individual strand of a rope or cord* (cf. dvi-, tri-guṇa “two-, three-ply), fr. \*gr-no-; Grk gurgaθós “basket (of wickerwork)”, etc., according to Buck (SS: §9.19).

HS: CA ġaraʼu “crookedness in *one individual strand or ply of a rope or cord/string that may affect other plies*”.

#### 3.4.25 Proto-IE-HS word [garš-] “to gnash, grind”

IE: Arm. krĉem “to gnash”, Lith. grukšiu, -ėti “to crunch”, OCS. grysti “to gnaw, bite”, Goth. krusts “gnashing of teeth”, Ir. bruighim “to crush, pound”. IECD, 299, 372; SS: §4.58; WP. I, 697f.

HS: CA ġaraša “to gnash the teeth” as well as “to grind”, Heb. gāras ~ gāraś “to break in pieces, crush”, Syr. grs id. (OT, 204), OffAram., Jp., Mand. grs “to grind, pound”. DRS III, 192; NWSI I, 235.

#### 3.4.26 Proto-IE-HS word [gęrg-] “take over s.t.”

IE: Av. garəz- “to seize”, Arm. korzem id. IECD, 289.

HS: Egyp. grg “to take over s.t., to occupy”.

#### 3.4.27 Proto-IE-HS stem [gir-] “tree, mountain”

IE: Skt. giris “mountain”, Av. gairis id., OCS. and common Sl. gora id., Lith. gire “forest”, Toch. B karās “wood”, Alb. gur “stone”. SS: §1.22; IECD, 374; WP. I, 682; IER, 25.

HS: Egyp. gr “tree”, PChad. \*gr- “bush” (Carnochan, 1975: 462), CA ġarra-tu “a piece of wood or stick used for hunting”; girgiri “a kind of plant”; garru, pl. giraru, “mountain”, Ga. gara “hill”, Amh. garra “to pile up stones, wood”, gara “mountain”, Gour. gara “mountain” (DRS III, 176).

The root is also found with prefixed /n-/ in all Semitic languages and dialects (see §2.11.77 above). It is also found with prefixed [š-] as in CA šaġaru coll. “tree”, Assyr. šigaru “bolt (of a door)” (King, 1898: 388).

#### 3.4.28 Proto-IE-HS word [garʼ-] “to attack, dare”

IE: Grk khráo “to attack, fight”, Lith. griauti “to destroy”, Latv. graut id., Lat. ingruere “to break in, fall upon”. SS: §11.27, IECD, 342.

HS: Ug. gr “to attack”, Akk. garū “be hostile”; gērū “enemy”, Syr. tegrā, Mand. tigrā “quarrel”, Heb. hitgāre “to combat, fight” (DRS III, 177) also “to content with, wage war against” (OT, 202), Tham. grt “protection” (Branden, 1950: 512), CA ġaruʼa “be courageous, daring”, ta-ġarraʼa “to dare”, Kab. girra “war”, grurej “be demolished, ruined”.

#### 3.4.29 Proto-IE-HS word [garb/-m] “back, shoulder, body”



IE: OCS. grubu “back”, Russ. gorb, Pol. garb “hump”, Lith. grubas “hump, lump, hillock”, ON. kropps “body”. IECD, 298, 300; WP. I. 595ff.

HS: Som. garab “back, shoulder”, Ga. gurm “shoulder”, Af. garab “side, part”, Ag., Bil. gurbat “back”, Amh. garba “shoulder” (Zaborski, 1975: 323; HED, 74), Sab. grb, grbt “body” (SD, 50).

With. m-ext.: Lat. grūmulus “hillock”, Lith. grumulas “lump”, etc.: Sab. grm “body (of animal)” (SD, 50), CA ġirmu “body, bulky”, OffAram. grm “bone” (NWSI I, 235), Heb. gerem, Syr., BAram. grm “bone” (OT, 204).

**3.4.30** Proto-IE-HS word [gar’-] “to drink, swallow”, fr. an ext. of a stem [gar-] in CA ġarra “to eat up, graze”; CVIII ’iġtarra “to chew the cud”, Heb. grr “chew the cud, ruminate” (OT, 202), Ak. girru- “provisions for a voyage”. By redupl.: Jp. gargerānā, Syr. gaggerānā, “voracious, gluttonous”, CA ġarġara “to drink noisily; gargle”; ġarāġir- (pl.) “throat, gullet” = Heb. gargərōt (pl.) id. (OT, 202).

IE: Skt. girati “swallows”, Av. gar- “to eat, devour”, Lat. vovāre “to swallow, devour”, Lith. gerti “to drink”, OCS. and common Sl. žirěti “to swallow”. SS: §5.13; WP. I, 682; IECD, 656; IER, 25; IEV, 259; Meillet, Introd. 132.

HS: CA ġara’a “to drink” also “swallow”, Eth. ’gr (fr. \*gr’ by metathesis) “to devour, gulp”, Soq. gr’ “to drink”, Tne. ġar’āma id.

**3.4.31** Proto-IE-HS word [gir’-] “throat” is closely related to the word [gar’-] “to drink, swallow”. Thus [gir’] is an indirect deriv. of stem [gar-] “throat”.

A direct derivative of stem [gar-] exists in HS as Akk. girru “neck”, Ug. grgr “throat”, Syr. gaggartā “throat”, Tna. garəre throat”, Amh. ġararo, gororo, Gaf. gurarā id., with n-ext.: CA ġirānu “neck, gullet”, Heb. ġārōn id., etc. DRS III, 175f. Mand. gurgma “gullet, maw” (MD, 85), Ag., Bil. gurguma “throat” comes fr. the deriv. \*gar-gm- “to drink, eat, swallow” as in CA ġarġama id., Te. ġärgämä “to swallow, devour”, this fr. \*gar-g “to drink, eat, devour” as in CA ġaraġa id.

IE: Av. garo- “throat”, Toch. B kor id., Lith. gerklė id., OCS. grūlo id., Lat. gurgēs “gullet, valley, whirlpool”, Skt. grīva- “neck”. SS: §4.28; WP. I, 682ff; Meillet, Introd. 94; E-M, 438; IECD, 356f, 372f; DRLE, 68.

HS: Ge. ġər’e “throat, gullet”, Tna, Te. ġər’ id., Amh., Arg. guroro id., CA ġirī’a-tu fem. (\*fr. ġiri’a-tu) “gullet, throat”, Cush.: Ga. goraw “throat”, Som. gawra’ id., Sa., Af. gara’ id., Chad.: Tera gura, Mbara gur- “neck”, Housa gwaro “throat” (Cohen, 1970: 18, n. 45; HSED, n. 960).

**3.4.32** Proto-IE-HS word [garg] “house”, from an ext. of stem [gar-] “house” as in CA ma-ġarru “corridor, room”, Housa garii “town” (Parsons, 1975: 439), Som. guri “house”; Har. ġār “house, room”, W. gar “house”, S., Z. ġār id. Leslau, HED, 74.

IE: Skt. gr̥ha- “house”, Av. ġərəða- “cavern”, Goth. ġards “house”, Ir. gragan, graig “village”. SS: §7.12; IECD, 302.

HS: Eyp. grg-wt, pl., “settlement, homestead”: grg “to found, establish, settle in a country or district”, Gafāt ġäġġä (fr. \*ġärgä) “house”.

All are ultimately from a proot [gɛW]. See §2.12.40, under *Comments*, esp. n. 4 and n. 6 above.

### 3.4.33 Proto-IE-HS word [gary-] “running”

IE: Lith. *greitas* “quick, swift”, Latv. *greits* “lively”.

HS: CA *ġarā* “to run, flow”, *ġaryu* “running”, SA: Hars. *gerō*, Jib. *egori id.*, Meh. *gərō* “to precede”, Syr. *gārā* “to flow”, Te. *gāra* “to come” (DRS III, 186), Ga. *gari* “carriage, cart, wagon”.

3.4.34 Proto-IE-HS word [garm-] “to grumble, roar, crush”, fr. an ext. of a stem [gar-] as in CA *ġarġara* “sound” as a vb “roar, shout”, Har. *girgir bāya* “be noisy”, *gurur bāya* “to roar (animal), thunder” (HED, 75), etc. For the ult. primeval proot, see §2.11.58 above.

IE: Lith. *grumoti* “to threaten”, *grumsti* “to grumble”, *gramēti* “to crush, rumble, thunder”, Grk *khromados* “to roar, crush”, Av. *granta-* (fr. \**gramta-*) “enraged”, Goth. *gramjan* “to enrage, anger”, OE. *gremian id.*, OCS. *gromû* “thunder”, etc. SS: §1.56; 18.44, IECD, 340f; WP. I, 655f.

HS: Har. *gurum bāya* “to grumble, groan”, Te. *’agrāmṛāma*, Tna. *’agrāmārāmā*, Amh. *agrāmārrāmā*, Arg. *agārāmārrāmā*, etc. *id.* (HED, 75), BHeb. *grm* “to crush, gnaw” (OT, 204), CA *ġirmu* “sound; sonorous”; *ġurmu* “offence, transgression, crime”; *ġarama*, *’a-ġrama* “to commit a crime, wrong”; Sab. *grm* “wrong(fully)” (SD, 51).

3.4.35 Proto-IE-HS word [garm-] “to burn”, appears as an ext. of [gar-] in Av. *gar-* “to burn”, OCS. *gorēti* “to burn”, Arm. *ger* “hot”, Grk *thēros* “summer, harvest”: CA *ġārru* “hot”, etc.

IE: Grk *thermós* “warm, heat”, Skt. *gharma-* “warmth, heat”, Lat. *formus* “warm”, OPers. *garma-* *id.*, OIr. *gorim* “I warm”, Br. *gor* “heat”. IECD, 380f; CCG: §38; SS: §15.85; WP. I, 687f; IEV, 223; DRLE, 69; E-M, 380.

HS: Akk. *giru, girru* “fire, deity of fire”; *gurāru* “hot ash”, CA caus. *sa-ġara* “to burn”, etc. see §§2.2.4, 2.4.16, etc. above.

Related words are:

3.4.35a IE: OIr. *grian* “sun”, W. *greian id.*, Rom. *kham* “sun”. IECD, 383.

HS: CA *ġāriy-atu fem.* “sun, disc of the sun”. See §2.21.3.6 above.

3.4.35b IE: Lith. *garas* “steam, soul”, Latv. *gars* “soul, steam, spirit”.

HS: CA *ġiršiy* “soul”: *girwa-tu* “soul, spirit”.

### 3.4.36 Proto-IE-HS word [garn-] “to thresh, grind grain; grain”

IE: Lat. *granum* “grain”, OIr. *gran*, W. *gawn id.*, OCS. and common Sl. *zirno, zruno id.* Goth. and common Germ. *kurn id.*, Alb. *grune* “wheat”. SS: §8.42; CCG: §12.2; WP. I, 600; IECD, 405f; IER, 24.

HS: CA *ġarana* “to grind grain vehemently”, *ġarīnu* “place used for storing grain or wheat” also “threshing floor”, Akk. *ma-grān-*, Ug. *grn*, Ge. *gurn* “area on which grain is

trodden out or threshed, threshing floor” (DRS III, 188), Heb. grn id. (OT, 204), Sab. grn “threshing floor” (SD, 51).

### 3.4.37 Proto-IE-HS word [garθ-] “gather”

IE: Skt. grath- “to tie”; granth- “purse”, Serb. gratati “to gather”; OHG. kratto “basket”. IECD, 302; SS: §9.192

HS: CA ’iġranθma [ġrθm] “to gather together, gather and stick together”, Ga. gura “to gather”.

### 3.4.38 Proto-IE-HS word [garh-] “to praise”

IE: Skt. gūrti- “praise”: gr-, Av. gar- “to praise”, Lith. girti id., OPruss. girtwei id., Lat. gratus “pleasing, thankful”. SS: §16.79.

HS: CA ġarraha “make known, declare”, Ge. garha “be sweet, peaceful”, Amh., Gour. gār, Te. garəh “agreeable, pleasant, sweet”, etc. (DRS III, 184).

### 3.4.39 Proto-IE-HS word [garw-] “little, small (of anything)”

IE: Skt. hrasva- “little, short”, OIr. gerr “short”. SS: §12.59.

HS: CA ġirwu “little, small”, ġarwu “young of dog”, Akk. gerru “young of ferocious animal”, Moab., Phoen. gr “young boy” (DRS III, 177), Heb. *Gerah* used as *the smallest weight and coin* of the Hebrews (OT, 202; NWSI I, 233), CA ġarmūzu “small”.

### 3.4.40 Proto-IE-HS stem [gaš-] “hand”

IE: Skt. hastas “hand”, Av. zasta- id., Hitt. keššar id., Toch. A tsar id., Grk khéir id.: \*ġhes-, \*ġhser-, etc. HCG: §81; IEV, 100; SS: §4.33.

HS: CA ġassa “to touch with the hand”; ma-gassu “any place/thing the hand touches”, Heb. gāšaš, Ge. gasasa “to touch, feel”, Te. gässä “to wipe with the hand”; təgassäsä “to slap (or hit the face) with the hands”, Syr. gaš “to touch”, Jp. gešaš id., Mand. gšš, kšš, Aram., Syr. gšš “to touch”, Sab., Eth. gss id., etc. See §2.11.45 above.

#### Comments

CA *ġassa* above is not the only word in the language expresses “touch with the hand”, *massa/mašša* < maθθa, too, express “touch with the hand”, with a slightly different shade of meaning (see §§2.12.34 & 2.17.32 above). This suggests that *ġassa*, like *massa/mašša*, is from an older ġaθθa, which has also been preserved in the language in another variant ġatta id., and that both [maθ] and [gaθ] are cpds of [ma-] + [-θ] and [ga-] + [-θ] respectively. Also consider CA maθaṭa “touch s.t. on the ground (earth) with the hand”, a cpd of stem [maθ-] + [ṭa-] “earth”. For [ṭa-], see §2.17.29 above.

### 3.4.41 Proto-IE-HS word [ga’θ-] “frighten; soul, spirit”

IE: Goth. us-gaisjan “to frighten”, OE. gæstan id., Av. zaēša- “horrible”: OE. gāst “soul, spirit”, OS. gēst, OHG. geist id. SS: §16.11.

HS: CA ġa’šu “soul”; later also “heart”, ġa’aša “be frightened, agitated”, fr. [ġ’θ], used only in the passive: *ġu’iθa* “be frightened, agitated, shaken” = Heb. gā’aš “to shake

by sudden impulse; be moved, shaken, agitated, to quake”, Syr. g’š in passive “be shaken, moved violently to and fro, to quake” (OT, 200-201).

#### 3.4.42 Proto-IE-HS stem [ga’-] “to praise, exult”

IE: Grk gaĩō “to exult, boast”, Skt. gāve “exult”. IECD, 267.

HS: Egyp. g’w, gw’ “to praise, sing”, Ug. g’n “pride, arrogance”, Pun. gune, pl., “majesty, grandeur”, etc. see §2.2.28 above.

3.4.43 Proto-IE-HS word [ga’r-] “to cry out; cry, voice”, fr. an ext. of a stem \*ga’- as in Ug. g’-t- “bellow, low”, CA ḡa’ḡa’a, with redupl., “to make a noise”, Heb. gā’ā “to low, below”, Talm., Syr. gā’ā, Mand. gha “to cry out” (DRS III: 164; OT, 200), etc. see §2.11.58, esp. n. 1d above. Also see §2.17.55 for a different analysis of the same word.

IE: Grk gērus, Dor. gārus “voice”, Skt. jāre, A. jar- “cry, bawl”, OIr. gāir “cry”, gairim “to cry out, call”, W. gawr “cry”, gair “word”, Oss. zarîn “to sing”: PIE \*ḡār-, etc. SS: §18.13; IECD, 387; WP. I, 537; CCG: §67.

HS: CA ḡa’īru, ḡa’ru (fr. r. \*ḡ’r) “cry, bellow”: ḡa’ara “to bellow, howl” also Koranic (16. 53, 23. 64) “cry out, supplicate”, in MSA ḡa’ara “to cry aloud, howl, bluster”, Ge. ga’ara “to cry out, groan”, Te. gā’ara id., Heb. gā’ar “to curse, reprimand”, Syr. ge’ar “to growl, reprimand”, Mand. gharta “cry, noise, din”.

#### 3.4.44 Proto-IE-HS proot ga’-(ga’-)] “earth, land”

IE: Grk gē, gaia “earth”. The word is found in Thracian in place names and Illyrian in personal names (IECD, 319). Buck (SS: §1.212) sees, however, that the word is from pre-Grk origin. The word is, in my opinion, IE preserved by the above mentioned languages.

HS: CA ga’gā’u “earth”; ga’ga’a “to dwell or stay for a short period of time”; ta-ga’ga’a “to fall to the ground”, lit. ‘hit oneself against the earth’, Egyp. ge’ “terrace”, prob. Har. Arg., W. ge “country”, Har. gē “city”, S. ge “village”, etc. (HED, 66).

3.4.45 Proto-IE-HS stem [gu’-n-] “hand”, fr. a cpd of a proot [ga’] (see §2.17.83) above and proot [’a-] “hand”. A similar compound is Egyp. gíd’ “hand”: ḏ’-t “palm of the hand”.

IE: Av. gu- “hand”, Grk guōn id.

HS: Cush.: Som. ga’an “hand”, Oromo gana id., Sa. gina’, Af. genaa’ id., Chad.: tambaro “hand”, etc. (HSED, n. 916). For proot [’a-] “hand”, see §2.17.30 above.

#### 3.4.46 Proto-IE-HS word [ge’-y] “to deprive of”

IE: Skt. jyā- “to deprive of, oppress”, Av. zyā “to deprive of, injure”, etc. SS: §11.28; WP. I, 666f.

HS: Egyp. g’w “be deprived of”, CA ḡī’a-tu fem. “injury”.

#### 3.4.47 Proto-IE-HS word [ga’-y] “to sing”.

IE: Skt. jā- “to sing, chant”, Lith. giedoti “to sing”, Lat. gaius “jay, magpie”, OCS. gajati “caw, croak”: PIE \*gā(i), etc. SS: §18.12; IER, 18; WP. I, 526f; IECD, 263; IEV, 257.

HS: Egyp. g’ “to sing”. See §2.11.58 above.

### 3.4.48 Proto-IE-HS [gu’-gu’] “breast, flesh”

IE: OIr. cīch “breast”, NIr. cíoch id., W. cig, Br. kik “flesh”.

HS: CA ḡu’ḡu’u “chest, breast” also “bones of the chest (usu. of birds, esp. *geese*) as well as “flesh or muscles connecting the ribs”, Housa gaigay “nibble”.

3.4.49 Proto-IE-HS word [gaiḥam- or ga’ḥam-] “to perceive, see”, a cpd of [gaW-] (see §2.17.83 above) and [ḥam] “to see”: see §2.10.14, esp. *Comments* II above. It is also important to see *Comments* III of the same section.

IE: Goth. gaumjan “to notice”, OE., OS. gomian “to observe, heed”, OHG. goumen “to care, heed”, ON. geyma “to watch, heed”. IECD, 316.

HS: Egyp. gmḥ, gmwḥ (fr. \*gyḥm or \*g’mḥ) “to perceive, see, look upon”, CA ḡaḥama “eye”, often seen in dual, esp. in Poet. ḡaḥma-tā “two eyes (of lion)”; gaḥama “to look fixedly at”.

### 3.4.50 Proto-IE-HS stem [gau-] “cow, ox”

IE: Skt. gaus “head of cattle”; gavis “cow”, Av. gāus id., Arm. kov id., OIr. bo, W. bu id., OE. cū, OHG. kuo, Toch. A ko, B keu “cow”, (Lat. bōs), Latv. govs id. Meillet, *Introd.* 224; SOE: §219; WP. I, 396f; IECD, 368ff; SS: §3.23; IER, 26; DRLE, 69.

HS: Egyp. k’, g’ “bull”; k’y “cow”, gw “cattle”, CA waḡī’a-tu “cow”, which is clearly from \*ḡau’a-tu or \*ḡawī’a-tu fem. (for evidence, see “cow dung” below), Ga. gua “cow”, Sid. gāhō “bull”, Agm. kiwā “ox”, Chad.: Tumak guūy “bull”, Berb.: Izayan ayūgu id. (HSED, n. 905).

An important derivative of this stem is the following:

3.4.50a IE: Skt. gutha- “dung”, Av. gūθō id., OCS. govīno “dung”, OE. cwēad, OFris. quād “dung”.

HS: Egyp. k’y-t “dung”: k’y “cow”, CA ḡawā’u, ḡiwā’u “filth”; mu-ḡwī “filthy”. See §2.17.10 above.

### 3.4.51 Proto-IE-HS stem [gar-] “old”

IE: Skt. jaras “old age”, jarant- “old man”, Grk. geron id., Hitt. karuw “formerly”, karuwli “previous, ancient”, OCS. zrejo “ripen”: PIE \*ḡerē, \*ger-. SS: 8.42; WP. I, 599f; IECD, 394; HG, §115; IER, 23.

HS: PChad. \*gr- “grow old”, Ga. jarsa “old man”, jarti “old woman”: CA ḡārin “worn out from long use (house furniture)”, said of a path, “well-trodden” for the same reason.

### 3.4.52 Proto-IE-HS word [gawal-] “to err”

IE: Skt. hwar-, hwal- “to err, go crookedly”, OPers. zūra- “wrong, evil”, Av. zūrah- “wrong”, OCS. zûlû “evil, bad”, Lith. žūlus “obtrusive”: PIE: ḡhwel-. WP. I. 643f; IECD, 423 (PIE \*ḡhūl-).

HS: Eyp. g’l “to lie; falsehood”, Cop. gol “false”, Som. gaal “infidel”, Shh. gele “be sick”, Meh. gōlū, Soq. gyōle “sickness”, CA ḡwl “be led astray (usu. by the Satan) as in CVIII *’iḡtalāhumu ’aš-šaiḡānu* “they were led astray by the Satan”: ḡāla “to go around, wander” = Heb. gwl, gyl “to move in a circle” (OT, 191), Aram. gwl “to circle” (DRS II, 108), Chad.: Logone ḡgolō “round” (HSED, n. 948).

### 3.4.53 Proto-IE-HS stem [gawḥ-] “to weep”

IE: Grk goáo “to lament”, Lat. cūma “lamentation”, OHG. kumig “weak”. SS: §4.82; WP. I, 635.

HS: CA ḡāḥa, gauwaḥa “to weep, cry”; ga’iḥa-tu “catastrophy, calamity”, Ge. gwəḥya “be afflicted, grieved”, Te. ḡāḥa id., Eyp. ḡḥ “be weak”.

For the ultimate origin of this IE-HS cpd, see §2.25, n. 4b above and also §2.11.53 above.

### 3.4.54 Proto-IE-HS stem [gaW-] “to run”

IE: Av. jav- “hasten, rush”, Skt. jū- “to drive on”; gava- “swift; speed”, Arm. cor “to flow”: PIE \*ḡeu-. IECD, 395; WP. I, 555.

HS: CA ’aḡḡa, ya-’uḡḡu “hasten, hurry” also “attack an enemy”; ’aḡḡu “swift, quick” (see §2.11, n. 6b above), ’aḡa’a arch. “to flee”, expressing a meaning apposite to ḡā’a “come”. This suggests that /’a-/ of ’aḡḡa is orig. caus., and that /’a-/ of ’aḡa’a is neg. (§2.21.1 above), while /’a-/ of ’aḡā’a “to bring” is caus. We are left with a stem [ḡaW-], perh. related to such words as CA ḡāwaza “to pass over (e.g. *the speed limit*), surpass”, Sab. gwz “to go, flow” (SD, 51), BHeb. ḡāz “to pass through, pass over or away” (OT, 183), etc.

### Comments

CA [’aḡ-] above seems to be fr. a root [ḡwḡ] (see LA) and is an exact cognate of Lat. agō “to drive, carry on, act, do”, Skt. aj-, Av. as- “to drive, lead”, ON. ako “to ride”, etc.

### 3.4.55 Proto-IE-HS stem [gau-] “color”

IE: Av. gaona “color, hair”, NPers. gūn “color”, Lith. gauras “hair”. SS: §14.51.

HS: Syr., Jp., Mand. gawnā “color”, BHeb. \*gwn: BAram. gawēn “to color, dye”, CA ḡaunu “black, red-black”, also CA ḡā’a-tu “black and red”; ḡuwwa-tu “brown, dark”, ḡu’ra-tu “color”, ḡu’wa-tu id. See §2.15.21, esp. n. 8 above.

### 3.4.56 Proto-IE-HS stem [gau-] “place, space; to desert”

IE: Grk khōra “country” «also “space, place”, like *khōros*, both orig. “empty space”: *khēros* “bereft”, also “empty”: Skt. hā- “leave”», according to Buck (SS: §19.11).

HS: CA ḡiwā’u القوم بين بيوت “empty space between houses”; ḡauwu “space between earth and sky”; ḡauwu “place” also “region” (like *جو اليمامة*); Phoen. gw “community” (PG, 94), Sab. gwy “community group” (SD, 51).

On the other hand, CA CVIII 'îgtawā “to hate to stay in a place or country even if one lives in luxury” (notion of “leave”, “desert” is clearly implied here); 'îgtiwā'u “homesickness”: CA ġawā “be afflicted with extreme grief or love”. Moreover, CA ġau'a-tu “empty or deserted quarter or town” seems to be fr. \*ġau'a-tu.

**3.4.57** Proto-IE-HS stem [gaus] “to suffer want, fall away” as in Egyp. g' “to suffer want, be in distress; empty of, exhausted”. This is fr. proot [gau-]. See §3.4.84 below.

IE: Hitt. kaštan “hunger”, Skt. jase “am exhausted”; jasvan- “hungry”; jasuri- “starved”, Lith. gesti “to go out (fire), be extinguished”, Toch. A kās-, B kes- “to extinguish, go out”, Goth. us-qistan “to kill”. HCG: §81; WP. I, 693f; IECD, 357.

HS: CA ġūsu “hunger”; ġāsa “to annihilate”, Egyp. g's “to fall away, go out of repair; grief”, Ga. gusu “to wean”, Som. gayesan “hungry”.

With '-ext.: Heb. gāwa' “to breathe out one's life, expire, die” (OT, 185), CA ġā'a “be hungry”; ġū'u “hunger, starvation”, OSA gw' “be hungry” (DRS III, 108).

**3.4.58** Proto-IE-HS proot [gau-p] “hollow”, fr. an ext. of a root \*gau- with a basic semantic notion “inside, interior” as in OArām. gw, Heb. gaw, CA gawwu (dial. guwwa) “inside or interior”; guwwa-tu “hole, cavity; depressed land”.

IE: Grk gūpē “hole, cave, den”, ON. kofi “hut”, OE. cofa “cave” also “hollow in the rock”, Skt. gup- “hidden”: PIE geu-p-. WP. I, 561; SS: §7.13; IECD, 307.

HS: CA ġaufu “hole, hollow, bowels of the earth, interior (of the body: *thorax, heart*, etc.)”; ġawafa “to hollow”; ġauwafa “make hollow”; CX 'istaġaffa “be hollow, concave”, Heb. gūpā *dead body, corpse so-called from its hollowness* = CA ġīfa-tu id., Te. gof “interior (of the body as heart, soul)”: see §2.12.4, esp. n. 8, under *Comments* above.

For Skt. gup- above, CA mu-ġāfu “shut, closed (door)”.

For OE. cofa above, CA ġāba «دومثو ذلا نيد اوباج رخصلا داولاب» *Thamūd tribe who hollowed out (or hewed out) the rocks in the valley so as to use them as homes* (Koran, 89: 9), Tham. gwb “hole, pit, well”, Sab. gwb “part of temple structure”, Heb. gwb “to dig a well” = CA 'îgtāba. It is evident that ‘dig’ here = ‘hollow’ (§2.12.40, n. 1, under *Comments* above).

To my understanding, the basic difference between [gaW-] and [kaW-] is that the former = from ‘inside’ and the latter from ‘outside’.

**3.4.59** Proto-IE-HS stem [gaid] or [gaud ~ gūd] “good”

IE: Goth. gōþ “good”, OE. gōd id., Latv. guods “honor”, OCS. godīnū “pleasing”.

HS: CA ġaiyidu “good”; 'agwadu “better”: ġāda “be good, excellent”, Sab. gwd “swift horse” (= CA ġawādu “noble horse”), Meh. gid “good”, Te. gado “marvelous”, Tne., Amh. gud id. (DRS III, 105f), Ga. guddi “wonderful”, Shil. gada “be equal to” (Applegate, 1958: 52).

**3.4.60** Proto-IE-HS stem [gai-] with exts “to pour out”

IE: Grk *khéō* “to pour, shed”, Goth. *giutan* “to pour”, OE. *geotan*, OHG. *giozan*, ON. *gjōta* id., Skt. *hu-* “to pour a libation”, Phryg. *zaum* “fountain”: PIE \**gheu-*. SS: §9.35; IECD, 418.

HS: Egyp. *g’s, gš* “to pour out, sprinkle”, CA *ġāša* [ġyš] “to overflow”, in *Hadith* ‘al ‘istiskā’: «*wa mā yanzilu hattā yaġīša kullu mīzābin*», i.e. “flows copiously with water”, (LA), Te. *gāš* “branches, feuilles et terre dans l’eau” (Cohen, II, 109).

Heb. *gy*’ “to flow together, as *water*”; *gē’āyōt* “a valley, so called as *the place where waters flow together*” = CA *ġt’a-tu, ġai’a-tu* (OT, 189); *giyya-tu*, pl. *giwwu*, “swamp, marsh”,

With *h*-ext.: CA *ġāha* “to wash away (of a torrent)”,

With *d*-ext. as in Germ. above: *ġāda* “to pour out copiously (rain)”, etc.

It may belong here IE: Av. *uz-zav-* “gush”, Pers. *jū* “river, stream”, Arm. *cov* “sea” and HS: Heb. *gīhō-n* (fr. *gāha* above) “stream, river” also “the second of the four rivers of Paradise”, used before the names of several Asiatic streams, as the Ganges, the Araxes, etc. OT, 190, CA *ġaiḥū-nu*.

#### 3.4.61 Proto-IE-HS word [gā-’] “to go, come”

IE: Skt. pres. *jigāti*, Av. aor. *jāt* “go, leave; depart”, Latv. *gāju* “went”, OHG. *gēn* “to go”. WP. I, 542ff; IECD, 311; SS: 10.47; IEV, 258.

HS: CA *ġā’a* “to come”, Soq. *gw*’ “to flee”, G. *gaa* “to arrive”. In Berb. and most Cush. languages the root denotes “to be, become” as in Shil. *ga* “to be”, B.Sn. *ug* id., De. *ag*, Ch. *ag*, Qu. *ag* “to become” and also “to arrive”, etc. (VPHS: 82, n. 28). It should be noted that CA *ġā’a* also means “to become”, but that this meaning is a deriv. of notion of ‘*coming*’. There is also ‘*aġā’a*, caus., “to bring”, Chad.: Bolewa *gay* “to run away, ride”, Kabalay *giyā* “to come”, Buduma *gya* “to follow”, etc. (HSED, n. 910).

#### 3.4.62 Proto-IE-HS stem [gub-] “hair, tress”

IE: OCS. *cûbû* “comb, crest”, Russ. *cub* “forelock”, Arm. *gov* “tuft”.

HS: Egyp. *gyb-t* “hair, tress”. See §3.4.19 above for a possible connection.

#### 3.4.63 Proto-IE-HS stem [gy-] “horse”

IE: Skt. *haya-* “horse”.

HS: Egyp. *gyw*’ “horse”.

#### 3.4.64 Proto-IE-HS stem [gīl-, rarely gail-] “to rejoice”

IE: Goth. *gailjan* “make glad”, Mlr. *gāel* “relationship”, Ir. *gaol* “family, kindred”. SS: §2.81.

HS: Ug. *gyl* “to rejoice” (UG: 535), Amm. *gyl* id. (NWSI I, 222), Heb. *gīl* “to exult, rejoice” also “men of an age, generation”, CA *ġīlu* “generation” (OT, 191), Ga. *gēle* “friend”, Har. *gēl* “companion, friend (girl)” (HED, 70).

#### 3.4.65 Proto-IE-HS stem [mag-] “child”

IE: Goth. *magus* “boy”, ON. *mogr* “boy, son”, OE. *magu* “son, servant”, Ir. *magu* “servant”, Av. *maṣava-* “unmarried”.



HS: Egyp. *mg'* “child”, Mand. *mag* “female demon” (MD, 238), perh. CA *muġġu* “young (of a pегion)”.

**3.4.66** Proto-IE-HS stem [*mag-*] “might”, ult. fr. [*ga'-*] “greatness” (§2.2.29 above).

IE: Goth. and common Germ. *mag* “he can”, OCS. and common Sl. *možetŭ id.*, with d-ext.: Goth. *mahts* “might, power”, OE. *meaht*, OHG. *maht id.* SS: §9.95.

HS: Egyp. *mg'* “bravery”, OffAram. *mg* “garrison” (NWSI II, 592). With d-ext. as in Grm.: CA *maġd* “glory”.

**3.4.67** Proto-IE-HS stem [*rag-*] “to speak”

IE: Lat. *rogare* “to ask, inquire”.

HS: CA *raġā*, *ta-raġġā* “to beg, request, beseech”, with m-ext.: CA *raġama* “to speak vaguely, conjecture”, Ug. *rgm* “to speak”, Akk. *raġāmu* “to shout, howl”. See §2.7.9-10 above.

**3.4.68** Proto-IE-HS stem [*rag-*] “chief or head of a tribe”

IE: Skt. *rājan-* “king”, Lat. *rēx id.*, Goth. *reiks* “ruler”, Gaul. *rīx* “king”, W. *rhi id.*, Av. *rajas* “kingdom”: PIE *\*reġ-*, *\*rēġ-*, etc. WP. II, 362ff; EM, 864; IECD, 1066; SS: §19.32; Meillet, *Introd.* 217; IEV, 79; DRLE, 172f.

HS: Egyp. *rkyt* “shadow-god”, Som. *reg*, pl., “man”, Ga. *raga* “prophet”, CA *raġulu* “man”, orig. “chief, leader, etc. of the tribe”, ESA *rgl* “period of office”, Sab. *rgl*, coll. n., “arms bearing class of men”, Palm. *rgly* “man”. CA also has *raġmu*, sg. or pl. “friend(s)”. See §2.7.10 & 2.17.3 above.

**3.4.69** Proto-IE-HS word [*šagr-*] “to fight”

IE: Goth. *sacan* “to quarrel, contend”, OE. *sacan id.*; *sacu* “strife”; *sēcan* “to attack”, OIr. *saigim* “to go after, seek”.

HS: Egyp. *sgr* “to fight, strike”, CA *šāġara* “to fight, quarrel with”.

**3.4.70** Proto-IE-HS word [*šag'-*] “be strong”

IE: Skt. *sahati* “is able, overpowers”, Av. *haz-* “take possession of, gain”.

HS: CA *šaġu'a* “be brave, courageous”; *šaġā'a-tu* fem. “bravery”, Akk. *šegū* “be furious”, Heb. *šg'* “be infuriated” (Ryder, 1974: 102).

**3.4.71** Proto-IE-HS stem [*'ag-*] “tree”

IE: Grk *aigilos* “a kind of tree”, OE. *ac* “oak”, ON. *eik*, OHG. *eih id.* IECD, 6; WP. I, 10; SS: §8.61.

HS: Egyp. *'g*, *'gg* “plant, shrub”, CA *'aġma-tu* “thicket of trees”.

**3.4.72** Proto-IE-HS word [*'agn-*] “fire”, from an ext. of a stem [*'ag-*] “fire; to kindle a fire, burn” as in OEgy. *'gy* “to burn”, Som. *ōg* “to kindle a fire”, CA *'aġġa* “to burn”; *'aġġaġa* “to kindle a fire”; *'aġūġu* “shining”. See §2.5.8 above.

IE: Skt. *agnis* “fire”, Lith. *ugnis id.*, Lat. *ignis*, OCS. and common Sl. *ognŭ id.* IECD, 427f; WP. I. 323

HS: Ug. agn “fire” (UG, 532), CA ’ġm “to burn, flame up a fire, be hot”, Heb. ’agmōn “heated kettle” (OT, 11), Som. ōg “to kindle a fire”, etc. above. See §2.3.36 above.

**3.4.73** Proto-IE-HS stem [šag’-] “to sing”, a cpd of caus. [ša-] and proot [ga’-] (§2.11.58 above).

IE: Goth. siggwan “to sing”; saggwa “song, music, recitation”, OHG., OE. singan “to sing”, ON. syngva id. SS: §18.12.; IECD, 63.

HS: OEgy. sg’ “singing god”, Heb. \*šgh “to extol with praises”; šigāyōn “song, psalm, hymn”, Syr. šgy “to praise, celebrate in song; song, hymn” (OT, 1034). The cpd is seen in CA šingū “cymbals”, lit. *pair of brass plates* (or any metal) that are struck together or against each other”.

**3.4.74** Proto-IE-HS stem [’ag-] with exts “goat, (goat-)hide”

IE: Skt. aja- “goat”, ajina- “hide”, OCS. azīno “hide, leather”, Lith. ožys “goat”, Latv. āsis id., Alb. dhi id.: PIE \*ago-, \*agi-. IECD, 2; WP. I, 39; Meillet, Introd. 353.

HS: Eyp. ’gw “goat-hide”, CA ’uġā, pl., “dry hide”, with s-ext.: ’aġannasu “the strong of small cattle or camels”, the -nn- is an infix.

**3.4.75** Proto-IE-HS word [hagr-] “field”

IE: Grk agrós “field”, Lat. ager id, Goth. and common Germ. akrs id., Skt. ajras “open field, pasture”: PIE \*agros-. Meillet, Introd. 136; SS: §1.23.

HS: OAkk. agar “soil”, ESA hgr “plough land”, NWS hgr “soil, country, town” (Tyloch, 1975: 56, ft. 5), in CA *hāġaru* is used as a name of a number of towns in Arabian peninsula (LA): Sab. hgr also means “town” (SD, 56).

**3.4.76** Proto-IE-HS word [hagal-] “shame”

IE: Goth. agls “shameful”, Ir. āil “insult”, Skt. agha- “mischief, guilt”, Av. aya- “bad”. SS: §16.72

HS: CA, with l-ext. as in Germanic and Celtic, haġilu, haġulu “bashful, timid”; mu-hġilu “shameful”.

**3.4.77** Proto-IE-HS stem [hag-] “to speak”

IE: Av. aoj- “to speak, say”, Grk eúkhomai “to boast, pray, vow”, Lat. vovēre “to vow”, Skt. ūh- “to observe, consider”. IECD, 255; SS: §18.21; WP. I, 110.

HS: Ug. hgg “to speak”, Heb. hāgag “cry, prayer, murmur or sound of the harp or cithara, meditation”, CA haġhaġa “to roar, grumble, yell”. With y-ext.: DAram. hgy “to say” also “to grumble, moan”, Heb. hāgā, poet., “to speak” also “to meditate”; hāgūt “meditation, thought”, CA haġā “to speak ill of, satire” (§2.4.23 above).

**3.4.78** Proto-IE-HS word [ħa(n)g-] “narrow”, with an infix \*-n-, becoming part of the root in both IE and HS languages.

IE: Lat. *angō*, *angustus* “narrow”, Skt. *aṇhu-* id., Goth. *aggwus*, OE. *enge*, OS. *engi* id., Lith. *ankštas* id., Grk *ágkhō* “I press tightly”: PIE *\*anĝh-*. IECD, 24f; SS: §12.611; WP. I, 62f; EM, 51; Meillet, *Introd.* 136; DRLE, 6.

HS: Egyp. *ḥng* “be narrow”, CA *ḥanaġa* “to twist tightly”.

**3.4.79** IE: Lat. *angere* “throttle”, Grk *agkhō* id.

HS: Egyp. *ḥngg* “gullet, throat”, CA *ḥanġara-tu* fem. “larynx, throttle”, Har. *hangur* “throat”.

**3.4.80** Proto-IE-HS word [*sūg-*] “to suck”

IE: Ir. *sūgim*, W. *sugno*, Lat. *sugere* “to suck”, ON. *sūga* id., OHG. *sūgan* id., PIE *\*seug-*. IECD, 1333.

HS: Egyp. *swg* “suckling child”.

**3.4.81** Proto-IE-HS stem [*gād-*] “to desire”

IE: Lith. *geisti* “to desire, wish”, OHG. *gīt* “avarice”, OCS. *žīdat* “to wait”.

HS: CA *ġāda arch.* “to long for, desire”; *ġīda arch.* “be thirsty, hungry”.

**3.4.82** Proto-IE-HS word [*garap-*] “to dig, shovel”

IE: OE. *grafan* “to dig”, ON. *grafa* id.

HS: CA *ġarafa*, said of soil only, “to scrape away, sweep away, or shovel (soil)”; *miġrafa-tu*, instr. “shovel”, Heb. *mgrp* id.

**3.4.83** Proto-IE-HS word [*hagar-*] “daylight”

IE: Skt. *ahar-* “day”, Av. *azan-* id., Arm. *an-agani* “late in the evening”. IECD, 862. The IE word for “day” is closely connected with the word for “sun”: cf. Skt. *ahis* “sun”.

HS: CA *haġīru* “half of the daylight, time between noon and afternoon”; *hāġira-tu* “time of sunset”; *haġr-in* “about a year”, occurred in a fixed expression: «*ra’aitahu ‘an haġrin*» “I saw him after (about) a year”, but some say that *haġrin* here means “six days” (LA). See §2.4.16 above.

**3.4.84** Proto-IE-HS proot [*gę’-*] “poverty, need, want”

IE: Grk *khētos* “poverty”, Lat. *hiatus*. PIE *\*ġhīatos*, *ġhīt-*, etc. IECD, 418.

HS: Egyp. *g’-t* “poverty, need”. See §3.3.57 above.

**3.4.85** Proto-IE-HS word [*galam-*] “to cut the upper part of s.t.”

IE: Skt. *hala-* “to plow”, Arm. *jelm* “furrow”, OE. *gielm* “sheaf”, Goth. *gilþa* “sickle”: PIE *\*ġhel-* “to cut”. SS: §8.33.

HS: CA *ġalama* “to cut”, Ug. *gml* (fr. *\*glm*) “sickle”. With prefixed /-n-/ to the stem: CA *mi-nġalu* inst. id.

To the best of my knowledge, /-l-/ is an infix and ‘cut the upper part of’ is expressed by [*gam*]. The distribution of /l/ in CA and Ug. furnishes (*unneeded*) evidence supporting my intuitive knowledge.

**3.4.86** Proto-IE-HS [g̑-] “this”

IE: Lat. hic, haec, hoc, fr. stem ho-, hā-: IE \*ǵhō-. CG: §306, n. 3.

HS: Assyr. masc. aga, fem. aga-ta “this”, Heb. gē “this”. O’Leary, 1969: §97.

### 3.5 *PROTO-IE-HS* /t/

Proto-IE-HS /t/ is a voiceless dental stop. It is in IE /t/ and in HS /t/

#### 3.5.1 Proto-IE-HS proot [tu] “thou”

IE: Lat., Av. *tū*, Umbr. acc. sg. *tiu id.*, Grk *su*, Dor. *tu*, Toch. *tu*, OIr. *tu* “thou”, Arm. *du*, OE. *þū id.*, Lith. *tu*. IECd, 1449.

HS: Egyp. masc. *tw*, *θw* “thou”, Akk. and common Sem. perf. *-ta* and, imperf. *ta-* “thou”. The vowel /-u/ appears in HS in the masc. pl. /tu-m/ and fem. pl. /-tu-nn/ “you”: see §2.22.2 above.

As one may note, gender distinction in HS is indicated in the pl. forms above by masc. *-m* and fem. *-nn*. These two forms also indicate plurality. The same means of distinction also applies to vb: CA *katab-tum* “you masc. pl. wrote”; *katab-tunna* “you fem. pl. wrote”.

On the other hand, gender distinction is expressed in the sg. by changing final vowels, hence *'an-ta* “thou masc. sg.”; *'an-ti* “thou fem. sg.”, *katab-ta* “you masc. wrote”; *katab-ti* “you fem. wrote”.

As one may have grasped from the foregoing information on 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. pronoun, the pl. forms in HS are formed from the sg. pronouns by adding to them pl. forms /-m/ and /-n/, hence, Aram. masc. *-tūn*, fem. *-tīn*, Heb. *-tem*, *-ten*, Egyp. *tn*, etc. = Hitt. 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. *-teni*, Goth. *-þ* (as in *bairi-þ* “you pl. bear”), Skt. *-tha*, etc.

Finally, in response to a question whether Proto-IE-HS [tu] is from an earlier [θu] or just the fem. from an earlier [θu], I say that this is not a pressing issue in the time being, and that one should think deeply about the consequences of either decision he undertakes.

#### 3.5.2 Proto-IE-HS proot [ta'] “this”

IE: Luw. *tas* “this, that”, Skt. *tad* “that”, Grk *tó*. Goth. *þata*, Lith. *tas* “this, that”, Hitt. *ta* “then, next”.

HS: Egyp. *t'* “this”. The presence of variants such as *θn*, *dn* “this” may be evidence that /t-/ may be from /θ-/ . Also, comp. Egyp. *tn* “where”; *tnnw* “whene” with Toch. B *tane*, *tne* “here, there” (Egyp. *dí id.*), Lith. *tenĩ*, *tenais* “there”, Dor. *tēneĩ id.* perh. see §3.5.15 below.

CA *tā* or *tī* fem. (of masc. *ḏā*) “this”, Tna., Te. masc. *tu*, fem. *ta id.*, etc. see O'Leary, 1969: §95: see §3.19.3.4.5 below.

#### 3.5.3 Proto-IE-HS stem [tag-] “to touch”: see §3.11.2 below.

IE: Lat. *tangere* “to touch”, OE. *accian* “to stroke”, Grk *tetagón* “having seized”: PIE *\*tag-*. SS: §15.71; WP. I, 703f.

HS: Egyp. *tgñ* “to approach, draw near”, Ga. *tuka* “to touch”.

#### 3.5.4 Proto-IE-HS stem [tak-] “to pierce, stab”, pass. [tuk-]

IE: OCS. tûknoti “to stab, fix”, Russ. tknuti “to hit”, Arm. tnkem “to thrust, fix”, Hitt. tukkāri 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. “is fixed”, Grk túkos “hammer”. SS: §19.65; IECD, 1452; WP. II, 615.

HS: Egyp. tks “to pierce, penetrate”; tksy “knife”, CA tukka “be cut (off)” with takka “to crush”, Heb. tākak “to tear off”, Aram. tk “to bind in magic”, Phoen. tk “to oppress, harass”, Pun. tk “to bind, menace”. See §2.10.17 above.

Notions of ‘pierce, stab’ and ‘fix’ are ultimately from different roots. For the latter notion, see §3.11.2 below.

**3.5.5** Proto-IE-HS stem [taq-] “to hew, cut”, ult. from [qa-] “form, shape, manner”: see §2.17.83. With suffixed /-n/: CA k̄āna “to fix, repair, set in order, make”. This is the same proot in §3.2.72 above.

IE: Av. taš- “to cut, hew”, Grk tektainō “to shape, carve”, Skt. takṣ- “to shape, hew, carve”, Hitt. taksmi “to join, build”, Lat. texere “to weave”, OCS. tesati “to hew”, Lith. tašyti id.: PIE \*tek-. IECD, 1374, SS: §9.45; WP. I, 717.

HS: Egyp. teḳ “to cut”, BAram., Talm. t̄qn “be set upright, established”, Syr. at̄ken “to arrange, fix”, JAram. t̄qn “to prepare, set in order” (OT, 1116; NWSI II, 1228), CA taḳina “be skillful”, Mand. t̄qn “set in order, arrange, construct”, etc. (MD, 489).

**3.5.6** Proto-IE-HS stem [til-] “hill”, related to [tal-] “to raise” below.

IE: Lat. tellus “earth”, Ir. talan “earth, land”, OCS. tīlo “ground”, ON. þeli “frozen ground”. WP. I, 740; IECD, 1375.

HS: Assy. tilu “mound” (King, 1898: 397), OAram. tl “hill of ruins” (AG, 7), CA tallu masc.; talla-tu fem. “hill”, pl. tilāl, Egyp. tenn “earth, ground”, Har. tullu “hill, hunch”, Ga. tullu “mound, hill”, Som. tūl “hunch” (HED, 149).

A derivative of this stem is [tal-] “forehead, neck”, that is ‘high’, seen in CA talīlu “neck”, OW. tal “forehead”, OBr. tal id., Cor. tāl “forehead, front”.

**3.5.7** Proto-IE-HS stem [tal-] “to raise, lift”

IE: Skt. tul- “to lift”, Toch. A. tāl- “to lift, raise”, B. tal- id., Lat. tollere “to raise”, Grk tlēmi “to bear, support”, Goth. þulan “to bear, suffer”: PIE \*tel-. SS: §10.22; IECD, 1401; WP. I, 738ff.

HS: Egyp. tn “to raise, elevate”, Heb. tālal “to heap up, make high” also Heb. tālā, BAram., Syr. tly “to hang up” (OT, 1106), CA mi-tallu “standing erect”, Som. tul “to heap”, Man. tl “to lift, hang” (MD, 497): PHS [tal-], with y-ext.: Egyp. tn’ “to lift, raise”, CA talwu “high rank (lit. ‘elevated’)”, preserved in the fixed expression: *talwu* (‘a)l miḳdāri (LA), and with ‘-ext.: CA tala’a “to raise, lift”.

**3.5.8** Proto-IE-HS stem [tal-] “to estimate, reckon”.

IE: Grk tálanton “scale, balance”, OBr. tal- “to pay”, W. talu id., OCS. tolī “so much”, etc. IECD, 1401.

HS: Egyp. ten “to estimate, reckon, count”, Som. tallan “to ponder”, CA talā, Koranic, “to read carefully and attentively” also “to narrate, relate”, Akk. tēlu “to pronounce distinctly”, Chad.: Ankwe tal- “to ask”, Sura tal id., Kera tulul “cry” (HSED, 2362).

For the OCS. word above, CA taliy “much, many”.

HS evidence shows clearly that Grm. words for “to tell, to count” belong here: ON. tala “to speak, talk”, OE. talian “to count, reckon”, tellan “to tell, count”, OHG. zalan “to count”.

### 3.5.9 Proto-IE-HS stem [tal-] “to linger, delay”

IE: Lith. talus “far”, Latv. tāls id., OPruss. tāls “farther”, Cz. ataleti “to delay, linger”. SS: §12.44.

HS: CA talā “to delay, linger”; tawāli “end, last”, tālī “next, following, i.e. *coming after*”, Aram. tly “be held in suspense, held back, hand”, Har. tālīs “slow, lingering, careless”, S., W., Z. dālāsā “delay, wait, last”, Ga. tālīsa id. (HED, 194).

### 3.5.10 Proto-IE-HS \*tal- “to abate”

IE: OCS. (u)toliti trans. “to quiet”, Lith. tylėti “be silent”, tylus “silent”, OIr. tuilim “to sleep”, OE. þyllan “to calm, pacify”. SS: §18.23.

HS: CA talla-tu “lying down, sleeping, inactivity”; talā’u “security”, Egyp. tnnw “failure”, tnw “eclipse”.

### 3.5.11 Proto-IE-HS word [taul-] “young tree”

IE: Skt. tāl- “palm-tree”, OSS. tala “shoot”, Grk.: Aeolic tālis “young woman”, Ir. geag “branch” and “young woman”, W. tawl “lopping”, Lat. tālia “graft”. IECD, 1368.

HS: CA tāla-tu fem. “young palm-tree”; tawīla-tu coll. “a group of boys and animals”; taula-tu “weaned (of animal); talwu, fr. taulu (by metathesis), “young of goat”. The same talwu is also seen as ṭalā “young of a padded or hoofed animal (gazelle, sheep, goat, etc.)”, Ge. ṭāli “she-goat”, Sab. twl “young palms” (SD, 148).

### 3.5.12 Proto-IE-HS stem [tam-] “to cut”

IE: Grk Attic témō “to cut”, Ionic támō id., OCS tîne, teti “to cut off”, Pol. tne, Russ. tinu “to strike”, OIr. tennim “to cut off”, Br. tamma “to cut off, chop up”. All are from PIE \*tem- “to cut”. IECD, 1378; WP I, 719; SS: §9.22.

HS: Egyp. tem, temtem “to cut”, Ga. tum “to strike”, Som. tun id. (Zaborski, 1975: 323), CA tamma “to break” with tummu “ax” and tumma-tu “fleece”. Notion of ‘fleece’ suggest that the orig. signification is ‘*cut off*’.

### 3.5.13 Proto-IE-HS *doubtful* stem [tim-] “fish; full, abundant”

IE: Skt. timih “large fish, whale”, Ukr. tīma “abundantly”, Serbian tma “fully”, Rus. tīma “myriad, swarm”. IECD, 1398.

HS: Egyp. tm-t “kind of fish”, tmī “complete; full” also “inundation”, tmr “kind of small fish”: CA tāmūru “water” CA tāmmu “full, complete, whole”; timman “fully, completely”, Phoen., Heb. tm “complete” (PG, 155).

### 3.5.14 Proto-IE-HS stem [tan-] “to stretch”

IE: Skt. tan- “to stretch”, Av. tan- id., Lat. tendere id., Grk teínō, Lith. testi (\*ten-sti) id., W. tynnu, Br., Cor. tenna “to pull, draw”, Goth. uf-þanjan, OE. þannan “to stretch”: PIE \*ten-. WP. I, 722ff; SS: §9.32, IECD, 1381-2; Meillet, Introd. 143.

HS: Egyp. *ten* “to enlarge”, Heb. *tānan* “to stretch out, extend”, Eth. *tn* “length” (OT, 1111), Ga. *tuntuna* “very fat”: PHS \**tan-*, with f-ext., CA *tanū-fa-tu* fem. “far stretched desert or land”.

Proto-IE-HS [tan-] gives rise to a number of derivatives in IE-HS languages. Two of them are:

3.5.14a IE: Lat. *tenēre* “to keep, hold”, Ir. *teann* “tight, stiff, firm”, Lith. *tenėti* “harden”.

HS: Egyp. *tnn* “be strong”, Egyp. *tnnw-t* pl. “tenant”, CA *tāni’u* id., Heb. *tnh* “to dwell; dwelling” (OT, 1110), Aram., Nab. *tn’* “contract, agreement”.

3.5.14b IE: Skt. *tanā* “offspring, descendant”.

HS: CA *tinnu* “person, self, one of the same age”.

#### *Comments*

All words above, in addition to words for ‘house’ as in Lat. *domus* and its IE-HS cognates (§3.6.9 below), Grk *audas* “ground” and its IE-HS cognates, and numerous others (§3.5.52.21 below), are in their entirety based on [ta- ~ da-] “earth, place”. See §2.12.20 above.

#### **3.5.15** Proto-IE-HS stem [tan-] “here, there”

IE: Dor. *ténei* “there”, Phryg. *tan* “there”, Lith. *tenai*, *tenais* id., Toch. B *tane* “here, there”, ON. *þinig* “hither”: PIE \**ten-*. IECD, 1379.

HS: OAram. *tnh* “here” (AG, 14), OffAram. *tnn*, *tnh* “here”, Palm. *tnn* id. (NWSI II, 1223-4), Egyp. *tnnw* “whence”, *tn* “where”. See §3.5.2 above.

#### **3.5.16** Proto-IE-HS word [tap’-] “be hot, to burn”

IE: Skt. *tap-* “be hot, warm”; *tapas* “heat”, Av. *tapta-* “hot, warm”, *tafnō* “heat”, OIr. *te* id., OCS. *toplu* id., Lat. *tepidus* “lukewarm, tepid”: PIE \**tep-*. SS: §15.85; Meillet, *Introd.* 143; IECD, 1383.

HS: Egyp. *tp* “flame, fire, to burn”, Ga. *tifu* “fire, embers”: CA *tafi’a* “become intense, angry”; with interchange between /t/ and its voiced counterpart /d/, CA *dafu’a* “be warm”; *dāfi’u* “warm”. See §2.2.47 above.

#### **3.5.17** Proto-IE-HS stem [tap-] “to beat”

IE: Toch. *täp-* “to bang”, OE. *þefian* “to palpitate”, Pers. *tapīdan* id., Oss. *čäf* “wound, blow”. IECD, 1383.

HS: OAram. *tpp* “to strike” (AG, 7), Phoen. *tpp* id. (WSI II, 1226), CA *daffa* “to kill” also (of a bird) “to beat its two sides with the wings”, *dafdafa*, *daffa* “to beat the drum”; *daffu* “drum” = Ug. *tp(p)* id. (UG. 534). See §3.1.6.5.22 above.

#### **3.4.18** Proto-IE-HS word [tapaθ-] “to smear”

IE: Lith. *tepti* “to anoint, smear”, Latv. *tept* id., OIr. *teith* (fr. \**teptis*) “smooth, easy”. IECD, 1383.



HS: CA taffaθa “to smear” also “to shave, pluck out (hair), and trim (finger-nails)”; tafθu “dirt”, this is fr. taf- as in tuffa “dirt”; taftafa “be dirty”; taffa “to spit”, Egyp. tef id., Aram. tepap “to spit”, Ge., Amh., Te. tāf’a “to spit”, Har. tuf bāya id., Ga. tufa, Som. tuf id., etc. HED, 148. With various exts: CA tafiru “dirty”, tafanu “dirt, filth”, etc. see below.

### 3.5.19 Proto-IE-HS word [tapal-] “to spit; filth”, related to [tapaθ-] above

IE: Lith. tēpalas “lubricant, anointment”, W. tail “filth”. (IECD, 1383).

HS: CA tiflu, tuflu “dregs, lees; foul”; tufālu “spittle”: tafala “to spit”, Egyp. tefen id. For the ult. orig. of IE-HS word, see §2.7.5, n. 8 above.

### 3.5.20 Proto-IE-HS stem [tar-] “to tremble, shake”

IE: Hitt. tarr(ani) “to tremble”, Grk trémō id., Umbr. tremito “let him frighten”, Toch. B trem- “to tremble”, Lith. trimti “to tremble, shake”: PIE \*tre-m-, \*ter-m, from an ext. of \*ter- or \*tre-, seen in words for “tremble, shake, fear” with the following exts:

With p-ext.: Lat. trepidāre “to tremble”, Russ. trepet, Br. triad id.

With s-ext.: Skt. trasāmi “to tremble, be afraid”, Lith. trēsti “to run”, Grk tréō “to flee”, and from \*ter-s: Lat. terrēre “frighten”, Umb. tursito! “frighten”, Av. tars- “to tremble”, Hitt. tarr(ami) id.

With k-ext.: Lith. trišu “I tremble”, Av. tarəš- “to tremble”.

With mb-ext.: Alb.trêmb “frighten”.

With ms-/ns-ext.: OCS. tresti, Russ. trjast “to tremble”

With bhl-ext.: Br. trivlia “to shake, tremble, quiver”. Cf. Meillet, *Introd.* 145.

HS: Assy. tarāru “to tremble, shake” (king, 1898: 399), CA tarra, tartara “to shake”; tarru “quick” (with mz-ext.: ’irtamazza [trmz] “to shake”), Har. a-trätärä “to shake the grain on a plate to separate it from sand” (HED, 150): Egyp. trr “to revere”.

### 3.5.21 Proto-IE-HS stem [tar-] “to destroy, rub”, related to [tar] “to shake”.

IE: Lat. terere “to rub”, Lith. trinti id., Hitt. tattar- “to wipe”, W. taro “to strike”, OCS. and common Slav. trêti “to rub, wear down”: PIE \*ter-. SS: §9.31; WP. I, 725, 728ff; EM, 1032ff; IECD, 1384.

HS: Egyp. tr “to destroy”, CA tarra “to extirpate”, ’a-tarra “to cut (usu. the hand) from the root”, Housa tirts “to thrust”, Ga. tersa “to tear”, Amh. tärättärä “to break”, etc. (HED, 150), Chad.: Glm tar- “to tear”, Kulere tur “to break”, Oromo tarara “to scratch, cut” (HSED, n. 2372).

3.5.22 Proto-IE-HS stem [tur- or tir-] as a vb [tar-], with ‘- ext. “boundary, door”, derived from \*tar’- “be powerful” as in Hitt. tarah- “be powerful, to conquer”, Skt. trā- “to protect, rescue”, Luw. tar-hu-un-za, nom-voc. sg., “name of the storm-god” = Egyp. tîr “might, power, strength”, CA tari’a “to rush into dangerous matters (e.g. *fight*) without fear”, tara’ā “to deter (someone) and dismiss him”.

IE: Skt. tîra “shore”: tr- “to cross over”, Grk terma “boundary, limit”, Lat. termen “boundary”, trāns “across”; intrāre “to enter”, Umb. termnas “ended”, W. terfyn “limit”,

Ir. teora id.: PIE \*ter-. SS: §1.27; WP. I, 732ff; IECD, 1386, 1420. Sturtevant (IHL: §36i) reconstruct IH \*terx-; Burrow (SL: 87) reconstructs IE \*tṛHeti.

HS: Egyp. tyry', try' "door", trtr (fr. t'rt'r) "strong place, fort", OAram tr' "door" (AG, 14), Nab., Palm., Hatra, Syr., Mand. tr' "gate, door" (NWSI II, 1233), CA tur'a-tu "river-mouth, water-course" and also "door", Soq. ter "bank, shore".

The stem is ultimately from a proot [ti'- or tiw-] "boundary, mark": Egyp. t' "boundary", CA tiwā' "mark".

The stem is also seen with h-ext. as in Sab. trh "to trace a boundary" (SD, 148). CA [trh] is not a root, and is seen in two words: turāhu "place-name" and in tarhu "loose, slack" from *rahwu* id. As in countless number of traditional roots, /-r-/ is an infix. The Sab. word is from a stem [th] as in OAram. thwm "border", CA tuhūm pl., i.e. thwm, "boundary, border".

Traditionally related words are:

IE: Ir. trāth "time", OCS. trajati "last", Cz. trvati id.

HS: Egyp. tr' "time", Ga. tura "delay".

### 3.5.23 Proto-IE-HS word [tarp-] "to enjoy, delight".

IE: Grk tértō "to delight, enjoy, satisfy", Skt. tarpaya- "be satisfied", Lith. tarpta "growth": PIE \*terp-. Meillet, Introd. 143.

HS: CA tarifa "to live in luxury"; tarafu, tarfu "luxury", SA trf "be satisfied", Amh. tārrāfā "be in excess"; tərḥ "profit, gain, excess", Ga. tirfi "gain, profit"; Ge. tārrāfā "be profitable", Tna tārrāfa, Te. tārrāfa id., Har. tārrāfa "be in excess"; atārrāfa "spare, gain". HED, 150.

The Proto-word above consists of proot [ta-] and stem [rap] in CA rafā-hiya-tu "luxury"; ta-raffaha "to live in luxury" < raffa "to provide s.o. with all he needs and take good care of, e.g. *to feed him, to lodge him, to surround him with love, affection, etc.*": raffa "to enlarge, to glitter, to shine".

All are ultimately from a proot [fai-]: see §2.12.15 above.

### 3.5.24 Proto-IE-HS word [tərs- or, much more likely, \*tərd-] "be dry, hard"

IE: Gr. térsomai "to get dry", Lat. torrēre "make dry", terra, lit, "dry land", Goth. þaursjan "be thirsty": PIE \*ters-. Meillet, Introd. 223; IECD, 1387, 1448; SS: §1.21; WP. I, 737.

HS: CA tariza "be stiff, dry, hard", Ga. turursa "to empty out", Egyp. Trtiu "the dwellers in deserts and mountains", prob. Har. țărăra "be thirsty".

### 3.5.25 Proto-IE-HS word [turb-] "soil, earth > village, people"

IE: Goth. þaurp, OE. þorp, OHG. dorf "village", OIr. treb "abode", OW. treb, OBr. treb "dwelling". CCG. §60; SS: §19.16.

HS: Akk. tarbūtu "earth, sand", CA turba-tu "soil", turābu "dust"; tarbā'u "earth"; turbatu "cemetery"; 'atrābu "peers, comrades, companions", Chad.: Housa turbāya "sandy soil" (HSED, n. 2426). For a deep analysis of the IE-HS word and of Lat. tribus "tribe", etc., see §2.7.24 above.

### 3.5.26 Proto-IE-HS stem [tay'- or tā'-] “to steal”

IE: Skt., Av. tāyu- “to steal”, Hitt. ta-a-iz-zi “steals”, OIr. taid “thief”, tai “silent”, Br. taô, tav, W. taw “silent”, Dor. tātaômai “I am in want, bereft of”, OCS. tajiti “hide, conceal”. IECD, 1360f; IHL: §41d.

HS: Egyp. θ' “to steal, seize, take”; θ'w-t, θ't “theft”, CA taya'a, tā'a “to take a thing with the hand” is a doubtful cognate.

The stem is also seen with caus. [sa-] as in Skt. stāyus ~ tāyus “thief” = CA sāī as a vb saīa or saīaya. See §2.2.35, n. b above.

### 3.5.27 Proto-IE-HS stem [tīn] “fig tree”

IE: Grk kó-tīnos “wild olive”, Lat. laurus-tīnus “wood-laurel”, ON. þinurr “pitch-pine”. IECD, 1399.

HS: CA tīnu “fig (tree)”, Akk. tittu, Heb. tyn, Mand. tina id. (MD, 486), Pun., OffAram. tyn “fig” (NWSI II, 1212).

### 3.5.28 Proto-IE-HS stem [tau-] “people”

IE: Illyr., Umb. teuta “people”, Osc. touto id., Lith. tauta id., Goth. þiuda “people”, OIr. tuath id., W., Br. tud, Cor. tus id.: PIE \*teu-. Meillet, Introd. 325; CCG: §13.

HS: Egyp. twy, t'w “men, folk, landmen of a country”, also in cpds as in dwty “evil man”: dw “evil, bad” and ty “man”. CA tauwu “one thousand horsemen” also “self”, Ga. tuta “multitude”. It seems that the stem is related to [tau] “death” as in CA tawā “death” with 'a-twā “to pass away, be gone”.

### 3.5.29 Proto-IE-HS stem [tau-] “servant”, related to [tau-] “people” above.

IE: Goth. þius “slave”, ON. þjōnn “servant”, Dan tyener id. OHG. dionon “to serve”.

HS: Egyp. tw' “servant”, CA taura-tu “female slave”.

### 3.5.30 Late Proto-IE-HS word [ta'r] “to protect, be strong”

IE: Lat. tuērī “to protect”, Skt. tāuti “is strong”, Av. tavah- “strength, might”, OPers. tav- “be strong”. SS: §11.26; IECD, 1396; WP. I, 706.

*It is worth-noting that Lat. tuērī “to look at, see” must be kept distinct from tuērī “to protect”; these belong to two different roots: tuērī “to look at, see” is from [ta'ar-], as in CA ta'ara, 'a-t'ara “to look at intently, stare”, this is with a prefix /t-/ fr. [ar-]: see §2.7.11 above.*

HS: Akk. te'ēru “to lead” (AG, 108), CA ta'aru “the breaking out of war”, Ug. t'rt “scabbard, sheath” (UG, 535), Egyp. θ'r “be strong, protected”; θ'r-t “strength”.

Derivatives of [ta'r-] are IE: Lat. tūtus “whole, safe”, Grk sāos “safe”, Goth. þiup “good” = HS: Egyp. θ'ri “whole, sound” also “protected, strong”.

### 3.5.31 Proto-IE-HS stem [tau-] “near, soon”

IE: Lith. tuvi “near”, Latv. tuvū id., OPruss. tawischān “the nearest”.

HS: CA tauwa-n “right off, soon”.

**3.5.32** Proto-IE-HS word [šatal-] “to steal”, fr. [šal-] “to plunder, steal”

IE: Goth. *stilan* “to steal”, OE., OHG. *stelan*, ON. *stela* id.

HS: For a deep study of [šatal], which is orig. CVIII of [šal-] “to steal”, see §2.8.19 above.

**3.5.33** Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼat-] “season, time, year”, it may be related to Skt. *atati* “goes, wanders”, CA *ʼatā* “to come, go”: see §3.17.10 below.

IE: Lat. *annus* (\*at-nus) “year”, Umb. *acnu* (\*at-nu) id., Goth. *aþnam*, dat. pl. id., OPers. *aθnam* id.: PIE \*at-, i.e. Xat-. SS: §14.73; IECD, 39f; WP. I, 41f; EM, 55; IEV, 195

HS: Egyp. *ʼt* “the time of culmination of some act or emotion”, CA *ʼitāwa-tu* “land tax”, usu. *paid once a year in the harvest season*; *ʼitāʼu* “product, produce (of land)”, Sab. *ʼtw/y* “be produced (crops); crop-yield” (SD, 9).

**3.5.34** Proto-IE-HS stem [wat-] “year, time, season”

IE: Skt. *watsa-*, *watsara-* “year”, Lat. *vetus* old, Alb. *vjet* “year”. SS: §14.73.

HS: Egyp. *ytr* “year” also “season, time”.

**3.5.35** Proto-IE-HS word [ʼištar-] “star”

IE: Hitt. *astiras* “star”, Grk *ástōr* id., Arm. *astir* id., with the loss of IE initial \*a-: Skt., Av. *star-*, Lat. *stēlla* “star”, Goth. and common Grm. *stairnō* id. Meillet, *Introd.* 136; SS, §1.54; IEV, 191; IER, 66.

HS: Egyp. *ʼsōr* “star”, Akk. *ištar* “Venus”, Mand. *ʼistar* id., Phoen. *ʼštr-t* (Arabic *ʼaštarūt*).

**3.5.36** Proto-IE-HS stem [hətam-] “last, end”

IE: Skt. *uttama-*, superl. adj. “last, highest”, Av. *ustəma-* id., Gr. *ústatos* “last”. SS: §13.35; WP. I, 139

HS: CA *hitāmu*, sounds like superl. adj., “last” also “farthest”; *hātima-tu* fem. “end”; *hatama* “to end, seal”, Egyp. *htm*, Heb. *ḥatam* id., OffAram., JAram., Pun. *ḥtm* “to seal (up)” (NWSI I, 413).

**3.5.37** Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼat-] “father”.

IE: Hitt. *attas*, Grk *átta*, Lat. *atta*, Goth. *atta*, OIr. *ate*, Alb. *at*, Oss. *ada*, OCS. and common Slav. *otĭcĭ* (\*ot-ĭcĭ) id.: PIE \*at-. IECD, 39; WP. I, 527; Meillet, *Introd.* 134.

HS: Egyp. *ʼt* “father”, Berb.: To. *tí* “father”, Ahaggar *tey* “stepfather” (VPHS: 194, n. 491; HSED, n. 2438).

Sem.: Ug. *ʼd* “father”, *ʼd-t* “lady”, Phoen. *ʼd-t* “lady”, etc. > Sem. *ʼadūn* “master, sir”. On the other hand, CA *ʼatiy-yu* “foreign man”, i.e. ‘*a man who is not from the tribe or clan*’ is not cognate. It is derived from the compound stem [ʼat-] “to come, go”.

Slavic *otĭkĭ* above is a compound consisting of [ʼat-] “father” and [-ak-/ik-], which is possibly the same /-ak ~ -ik/ in Ug. *ḥtk* “father”.

The presence of two or more words for ‘father’ in IE-HS naturally calls for a difference in meaning or in use. Otherwise, only one of them would have come down to

us. It is possible that \*pa-/ab- was the ordinary word for “father, biological father”, whereas \*’at- was used as either (a) *a mark of respect in addressing old people or superiors*, or (b) *a word for “unbiological father”*.

**3.5.38** Proto-IE-HS word [kut’-], fr. an ext. of [kut-]: see below

IE: Grk kótulos “cup”, Lat. catīnus “bowel for food, dish”.

HS: Egyp. kt’-t “cooking pot”, CA kut’-tu “small bucket”.

It is most likely the IE words are borrowed from Sem., and so are Grk kútus “jar, body, belly, hollow”, kutīs “box, basket”: Akk. kuttu “vessel”.

**3.5.39** Proto-IE-HS stem [mat-] “right, good”

IE: OBr. mat- “good”, Br. mad id., Mlr. maith id., Cor. mas id. Hier.-Hitt. matai, acc. pl., “big, many”, Seq. mat “good, fine, well (of weather)”: PIE \*mat-. IECD, 735.

HS: Egyp. mt-t “right, exact, correct”, CA ’a-mtā “to have much”.

**3.5.40** Proto-IE-HS stem [mat-] “serpent”

IE: W. mad “reptile”, Latv. matenis “black water snake”: PIE \*mat-. IECD, 735.

HS: Egyp. mtmt “a serpent god”.

**3.5.41** Proto-IE-HS stem [mat-] “with, middle”, in Egyp. m “with”

IE: Grk metá “with” also “in the midst of”, Phryg. me(t) “with, by”, Alb. mjet “middle”, Goth. miþ, mid “with”, OE. mid, OHG. mit id., Av. mat “with, by”: PIE \*met-. IECD, 762; WP. II, 236.

HS: Egyp. mtw “with”, Heb. matah “middle”, CA matā id., matnu also “middle”.

**3.5.42** Proto-IE-HS word [mast] “part of a boat”

IE: Lith. mastas “mast”, Russ. mačta, Pol. maszt id., OHG. mast, OE. mæst id.

HS: Egyp. msty “a part of boat, boat”.

**3.5.43** Proto-IE-HS stem [tę-] “nurse”

IE: Lith. teta “aunt”, OCS., Cz. teta id., Russ., Bulg. tetka id.

HS: Egyp. tθ “nurse”.

**3.5.44** Proto-IE-HS word [natr-] “serpent”

IE: Lat. natrix “water snake”, Goth. nadrs “snake”, OE. nædr id., OIr. nathir, W. neidr, OBr. natrolion, Cor. nader id. CCG: §62; IECD, 827f.; SS: §3.85.

HS: Egyp. ntr “serpent-god”.

**3.5.45** Proto-IE-HS \*hat- “to stab, pierce”

IE: Hitt. hatta “to stab, pierce”, Arm. hatenem “I cut”. IHL: §22a.

HS: Egyp. ht “to pierce”, CA hatta “to stab”, Heb. ħitēt “to break”, DAram. ħt “terror, fear” (NWSI413).

**3.4.46** Proto-IE-HS word [tak] “draw near”

IE: Toch. tāk-, tek “to touch”, VLat. toccāre “to strike, hit”, later “to touch”, Lith. tekti “befall”.

HS: Egyp. tekm “to approach”.

### 3.5.47 Proto-IE-HS word [wētər-] “other”

IE: OCS. vûtorû “other, second”, OE. ðper id.

HS: Egyp. wet “other”: CA tatrā “one after another” (LA).

### 3.5.48 Proto-IE-HS word for ‘animal’

IE: Hitt. hu-u-i-tar “animals” is strangely traced by Sturtevant (IHL: §47i) to PIE \*weid- “to see, know” (§3.6.28 above).

HS: ḥwtȳr “a kind of animal”.

3.5.49 Proto-IE-HS word [sata’g- or sta’g-<sup>299</sup>] “to cover, hide; roof”, a pd of a number of proots, the most obvious are caus. [sa-], another caus. [da’-] plus [gu-] “roof”: CA suḡuḡu pl. “roof”, Ug. gg id., etc. see §2.2.37 above = Skt. guh- “to hide”, Lith. gužti “cover with something warm”, etc. The corresponding verb in CA would be \*ḡāḡa and never \*ḡūḡa. *It is evident here and in many other cases that the root vowel of the verb in IE languages is, generally speaking, taken from the noun.*

The first caus. morpheme to be added to [ga-] was [da’], hence Egyp. dg(y) “to hide (oneself)”, CA daḡā “to hide, cover” etc. see §2.1.6.5.4 above. Later, [sa-] was prefixed to [dag], giving rise to sa-dag, hence Egyp. s-dg. In the course of time IE and Egyp. lost the vowel of the 1<sup>st</sup> syllable of sadag- and, in consequence, /-d-/ was changed into /-t-/ by assim.

IE: Skt. sthag- “to cover, hide”, Grk stégō id., Lat. tegere “to cover”, Lith. dengti “to cover”, ON. þekja, OE. þeccan id.: PIE \*(s)theg-, \*stheg-, \*steg-. To this root also belong among others Lat. tectum, OIr. tuige, W., Br. to “roof”, OE. þæc, ON. þak, OHG. dah, Grk (s)tégos, Lith stogas “roof”. IECD, 1315; SS: §§12.26, 7.28; WP. I, 620f; CCG: §35.4; IEV, 285, IER, 65.

HS: Egyp. stg “to hide oneself, take refuge”, PChad. \*t-k- “to hide” (Carnochan, 1975: 464, n. 48), Har. tāḡān “shelter, curtain”, Amh., M., A., W. tāḡān “shelter” (HED, 149), Cush.: Ga. doksa “to hide, conceal”, Som. dugsi “shelter”.

Some derivatives are:

3.5.49a IE: Lith. dangus “sky”.

HS: CA duḡna-tu fem. “cloud, rain”.

3.5.49b IE: OE. dung “dung”, OHG. tunga “manuring”, tunc “underground room”, etc. developed from “covering” > “dung” > “heap, underground room” (cf. SS: §4.66, WP. I, 854).

HS: Som. digo “dung”, CA duḡā, pl., “hiding cell for hunters”; daḡā, in a sentence, “to heap”.

---

<sup>299</sup> There is a different analysis of the word above, but concrete evidence to prove it is lacking: CA CI ’aḡā “to hide” and CX would naturally be (’i)sta’ḡa “to hide oneself” = Egyp. stg above.

**3.5.50** Proto-IE-HS word [sata'-] “to stand, to place”, a compound of a caus. prefix [ša] and a proot [ta'-] ~ [da'-] “to stand, place”

IE: Skt. sthā- “to stand”, Hitt. titta- “cause to stand, place”<sup>300</sup>, Av. hištaiti “stands”, Lat. sistit “sets”, stās “you stand”, Goth., OE. standan id., Grk Hom. stēō “may have set”: PIE \*sthā-. SS: §12.15; IECD, 1308ff; EM, 979ff; WP. II, 603ff; HG: §76: IE \*(s)tā-, IH \*(s)teh-; Lehmann (PIEP: §11.1) reconstructs IE \*steA-.

HS: Egyp. d' “to place, to set” (EHD II, 865), with prefixed caus. /s-/ and progressive assim. of /-d-/; st' “to place alongside” (EHD II, 707), Egyp. st's “to lead”, tys “to sit, seat oneself”, Phoen., Pun. št, šyt “to put, place, establish”, Cush.: Ga. taa “to sit”, etc. gen. HS. For the ultimate origin of all words above, see §2.9.18 above.

Another CA related word belonging here is šaṭa'a “to resist, withstand”, which is clearly from sata'a (for the interchange of /s/ and /ṣ/, see §2.2.48 above). Here also belong Egyp. t'ī “to withstand, resist” (EHD II, 818), Har. ti' “courage, heart *as seat of courage*”.

Some derivatives of [ta'- ~ da'-] are:

3.5.50a IE: Hitt. stapp- “to shut”, Skt. stabhnāmi “to stop, fix”, etc. almost in all IE languages.

HS: Egyp. st'īb (\*st'b) “to shut up, stop”. The CA cognate may be tāba “repent”, lit. *stop do*.

3.5.50b IE: Skt. sthāyah “receptacle”.

HS: Egyp. st' id.

3.5.50c IE: Av. staorō “draught-animal”, Goth. stiur, OHG. stior “bullock, steer”.

HS: CA saṭru ~ ṣaṭru (\*sat'aru) “young he-goat”.

3.5.50d IE: Goth. stamms, adj., “stammering”, OHG. stammalon “to stammer”.

HS: Egyp. t'm “be silent”.

3.5.50e IE: Grk stūō “stiffen” “be stiff, hard, harsh”, etc.

HS: Egyp. t's “harshness”.

3.5.50f IE: Av. stānō “place, stable”, Toch. stānk “palace”, Lith. stōnē “stable, stall”, etc.

HS: Egyp. t'-t “room, chamber”.

3.5.50g IE: OE. stofa “bathroom”, OHG. stuba id., ON. stofa “sitting-room, main room”, etc.

HS: ma-ṣṭaba-tu “a platform at the entrance of a house” also “a place where people gather, bench for sitting on” (whence English *mastaba*).

---

<sup>300</sup> The Hitt. word is from proot [ti'] plus caus. ta-, hence ti'ta- > titta-.

3.5.50h IE: OFris. stapul “anvil”, OE. stapol “base, pillar”.

HS: CA mi-ṣṭabu inst., with loss of \*-ʾ-, “anvil”.

3.5.50i IE: Hitt. is-ta-an-ta-an-za “tarry, delay” (IHL: 41e).

HS: Egyp. t’ “time”, CA hi-t’u-n id. For the semantic relationship between “time” and “tarry, delay, linger”: CA ’anā, ’annā “to tarry, delay, linger” is from ’aniy “time”, Grk χρῖς “to delay” is from χρόνος “time”, etc.

3.5.50j IE: Skt. tud- “to beat, push” and Lat. tundere id. are cognates with Goth. stautan “to strike, push”, and all are derived from \*sthā- or \*steA- “to stand” (PIEP: §7.5).

HS: Egyp. t’, t’y “to beat”, CA ha-ta’a, ma-ta’a “to strike, beat”. See §2.4.6 above.

3.5.50k IE: OE. stēor “guidance”, ON. stjori “pilot”, etc. Such words are impossible to be from any stem other than [’ar-] “to see”. See the following sections above in the given order §§2.17.2, 2.7.3, 12.10.11, & 2.7.11. An important question arises: should we consider the Grm. word as a compound /s-/ plus a stem \*-tēor = Lat. tuērī “to look, see” (§3.5.30 above) or a compound of /st-/ plus [’ar]? The 2<sup>nd</sup> choice directly leads to CA CX (§2.1.7.2 above): (’i)star’ā (~ \*sta’rā) “make oneself see in advance”.

### 3.5.51 Proto-IE-HS stem [tau-] “one”

IE: Skt. tava- “one, one...the other”.

HS: CA taw “one”, Egyp. twtw “one, anyone”.

### 3.5.52 PIE /t/ = PHS /ṭ/, the emphatic counterpart of /t/

PHS /ṭ/ shares with /t/ the same point and manner of articulation; the *only* difference is that /ṭ/ has an additional point of articulation- *the back of the tongue is simultaneously raised toward the velum in its articulation*, hence the term ‘*velarized*’. This Semitic phoneme does not exist in Egyp., and it often interchanges with other phonemes in CA. It owes its origin mainly to phonemes like /t/ and /d/.

#### 3.5.52.1 Proto-IE-HS stem [ṭal-] “dew”

IE: Arm. tel “heavy rain”, Mlr. delt “dew”.

HS: CA ṭallu “dew”, Ug. ṭl id. (UG, 532).

#### 3.5.52.2 Proto-IE-HS stem [ṭam-] “to cover; darkness”

IE: Skt. tamas “darkness”, timira- id., OHG. demar “twilight”, Lat. tenebrae “darkness”, OCS. tîmā, Lith. tamsa “darkness”: PIE \*tem-. IECd, 1378.

HS: CA ṭamsu “blindness”; ṭāmisu “dark” (with infixed liquid: ṭrms ~ ṭlms, ṭrmš, etc. “darkness”, also *dāmisu* “dark”), Har. tā-ṭamāsa “go astray, be lost, disappear”, Ga. tamsa “dissolve” (HED, 154), Egyp. tms “to cover over”: PHS \*ṭam “to cover” in CA ṭamma, ṭamara “to burry”, ṭamha-tu “darkness”, OffAram., DA ṭm’ “impure spirit” (NWSI I, 424), Heb. ṭm’ “impure, defiled”, ṭmn “to hide, conceal” (OT, 366-367), etc.



CA also has ‘atmu, fem. ‘atma-tu “darkness”; this is a cpd of [‘a-] and \*tam-. The first element could be a proot for ‘piece, part’ or for ‘darkness’. Both meanings of [‘a] exist in Egyp.

### 3.5.52.3 Proto-IE-HS stem [ṭin-] “clay, mud”

IE: OCS. tina “mud”, Russ., Bulg. tina id., Pers. tīn id., OE. ḡīnan “grow damp”, Lat. cōr-tīna “cauldron” (cōr- fr. \*quer- “pot”), Grk rhē-tīnē “resin” (rhēō “to flow”). IECD, 1399.

HS: CA ṭīnu “clay, mud”, OffAram. ṭyn “clay, foam” (NWSI I, 421), Heb. ṭyn “to besmear with clay or mud” (OT, 365).

### 3.5.52.4 Proto-IE-HS stem [ṭan-] “to roar”

IE: Skt. tanyati “to resound, roar”, Lat. tonāre “to roar, thunder”, Lith. stenėti, OCS. stenati “to groan”

HS: Egyp. tn’ “to cry out, pray”; tn’t “clamor, outcry”, CA ṭanīnu “resounding, noise”.

### 3.5.52.5 Proto-IE-HS stem [ṭar-] “tender, young”

IE: Grk térēn “tender, soft”, Skt. taruṇa- “tender, young, fresh”, Pers. tar “fresh”, Oss. tārna “boy”, ON. þerna “maidservant”. IECD, 1384f.

HS: CA ṭariy “tender, soft”; ’uṭruwāniyyatu arch. “youth, early life”, Ge., Te. ṭray “raw”, Amh., Tna., S, W., Z. ṭəri, Har. ṭiri id. (HED, 155), Egyp. tr “be weak”.

### 3.5.52.6 Proto-IE-HS word [ṭarad-] “to expel, push”

IE: Lat. trūdere “to push, thrust”, Goth. us-þriutan “to annoy, make trouble for”, OE. þrēatian “to rebuke, threaten, press”, OCS. trudû “trouble”, Alb. trus “to compress, bruise”. IECD 1426, WP. I, 755.

HS: Assy. ṭarādu “to drive away, dismiss” (King, 1898: 350), CA ṭarada “to drive away, expel, dismiss, thrust”; mu-ṭṭradu “annoying” also “continuous, incessant”, Heb. ṭārad “to thrust”, BAram. ṭerad “to thrust, drive forth” (OT, 368).

### 3.5.51.7 Proto-IE-HS word [ṭauq-] “rope”

IE: OE. teah “bond”, ON. taug “rope, cord”, Dan. tov, Sw. tag id.

HS: CA ṭauḳu “collar” also “rope, esp. *one used to climb a palm-tree*”.

### 3.5.52.8 Proto-IE-HS word [ṭawar-] “to develop”

IE: Lith. tverti “to create”, OCS. šu-tvoriti “to do”, Bulg. tvoriti “to create, fashion”.

HS: CA ṭauwara “to develop”.

### 3.5.52.9 Proto-IE-HS stem [ṭaw’-] “can, be able”

IE: Skt. taviti “is strong”, Av. tavaiti “can”; tavah “might, power”, OPers. tav- “be strong, firm”. IECD, 1396.

HS: CA CX ’ista-ṭā’a “can, be able”; ’isti-ṭā’atu “ability, power”.

**3.5.52.10** Proto-IE-HS stem [tʰu- ~ tʰau-] “mountain”

IE: OE. tūn “field, farm, village”, ON. tūn “enclosed land”, OHG. zūn “fence”, Gaul. dūnum “mountain”, Ir. dun, W. din “fortress”. IECD 168; WP. I, 777.

HS: CA tʰuwā “mountain, valley in a mountain”; tʰiyya-tu “house, native land”, Egyp. dw “mountain”.

With r-ext.: CA tʰūru “mountain”, OAram. tʰwr id. (AG, 10), Syr. tʰurā id., BAram. tʰwr “mountain, rock”, Heb. tʰūr “a wall round about” (OT, 363-364), Amh. tʰārara id.

**3.5.52.11** Proto-IE-HS stem [tʰaiḥ-] “to sink”

IE: Grk dúō “to sink”.

HS: Egyp. tyḥ “to sink, submerge”, perh. CA tʰāḥa “to perish, fall and perish”.

**3.5.52.12** Proto-IE-HS stem [tʰaḥ] “to grind; tooth”

IE: Lat. dens “tooth”, Grk odoús id. Av. data- id., OIr. dēt, id., W., Br. dant id., Lith. dantu, gen. pl., id., Arm. atamn id. Meillet, Introd. 366; CCG: §8.1

HS: CA tʰaḥina-tu “molar tooth”, Heb. tʰeḥanōt pl. id. (OT, 364), Egyp. nḥd-t (fr. \*dḥn-t) “tooth” also “powder”: CA tʰaḥana “to grind”, Heb. tʰāḥan, OAram., Ugr. tʰḥn, etc. id.

*Are IE and HS words above cognate?* In investigating the etymology of HS words, we discover that the signification of vb tʰaḥan- above is confined to ḥinṭa- “grain” (§2.17.29 above). This shows clearly that shifting the order of radicals was once one of the most important methods of word formation, a fact I have already drawn attention to and placed much stress on.

**3.5.52.13** Proto-IE-HS word for “small”

IE: OCS: chudu “small, insignificant”, Russ. chudoj “bad, lean”, Cz. chuddy “poor”.

HS: Phoen. ḵṭn “small” > Grk γαδov (PG, 143), Heb., Syr., etc. ḵṭn id., Har. ḵaačīn “thin, lean”.

**3.5.52.14** Proto-IE-HS word [ḥaṭi’-] “sin, guilt”

IE: Grk aitiá “guilt”.

HS: Akk. ḥiṭu “sin, fault, evil” (AG, 77), CA ḥaṭī’a-tu “sin, guilt”: ’aḥṭa’a “to commit error, sin”; ḥaṭa’u “error, mistake”; muḥṭī’u “sinful”, Ug. ḥṭ’ “to sin” (UG, 535), OAram. ḥṭ’ “sin, offence” (AG, 10).

Lith. kaltē “fault, guilt”: CA ḡalṭa-tu fem. “fault, mistake”.

**3.5.52.15** Proto-IE-HS *doubtful* stem [ḥaṭ-] “tree, wood”

IE: Skt. atavi- “forest”

HS: Egyp. ḥt “tree, wood”, Akk. ḥaṭṭu “trunk of a tree, branch”, CA mi-ḥaṭṭu “a piece of wood”. VPHS, 107, n. 146.

**3.5.52.16** Proto-IE-HS stem [’iṭ-] “odor”

IE: Lat. odorari “to smell”: odor “odor”, Arm. hotim “to smell”, Grk ózōid., odmē id., Lith. uodžiu id., etc. IECD, 862f; IHL: §22a.

HS: Egyp. 'dn “some strong-smelling substance”, CA 'aṭina “to macerate; bad smell”, Berb.: Kab. adu “smell”, Shil. adu “odor, smell” (Applegate, 1958: 45), Har. aṭāna “fumigate; incense”, Ge., Tna. 'əṭan “incense”, Amh. ṭan (HED, 37).

Som. 'adar “scent” is from the root in CA 'ṭr “scent, perfume”.

**3.5.52.17** Proto-IE-HS word [ʔaṭam-] “soul, spirit”

IE: Skt. ātman- “soul”, OHG. ātum “breath”, OE. eþm id.

HS: Akk. eṭemu “spirit”, Egyp. 'tm “air, wind”, DAram. 'ṭm “darkness” (NWSI II, 837).

**3.5.52.18** Proto-IE-HS word [ʔaṭaš-] “to sneeze, cough”, with loss of initial \*/ʔ/ in IE.

IE: Lat. tussire “to cough”: tussis “a cough”, W. tisian “to sneeze”.

HS: Berb.: Shil. tusu “to cough”, To. eṭs id., CA 'aṭasa “to sneeze”; 'uṭāsu “sneezing”, Aram., Heb. 'ṭš “to sneeze”, Ge. 'aṭāsā id., Te. ḥaṭṭāša, Amh. anāṭṭāsā, Har. ḥaṭṭiš id., Cush.: Kam. hanṭišša'e, Ag., Bil. haṭiš “to sneeze”, (VPHS, 87, n. 52; HED, 88).

**3.5.52.19** Proto-IE-HS word [ʔaṭaš-] “thirst”

IE: OIr. itu, Nlr. iota “thirst”.

HS: CA 'aṭāšu, pl. 'iṭāšu, “thirst”; 'aṭišu “be thirsty”.

**3.5.52.20** Proto-IE-HS word [sṭu-] “oar”

IE: OE. stēor “rudder”, OHG. stiura id., ON. stýri id.

HS: Egyp. sdw, pl., “oar”, CA 'u-sṭuwāna-tu fem. “mast”.

**3.5.52.21** Proto-IE-HS word [waṭan-] “ground, earth”, ultimately from [ṭa-] “earth” (§2.17.29 above).

IE: Grk oudas (poet.), édabos “ground, soil” also “base, bottom”, Arm. getim “ground”. SS: §1.212

HS: CA waṭanu “homeland, one’s native country”; waṭā'idu pl. “base, foundation”, Sab. wḏn (fr. wṭn) “residence, homeland” (SD, 157), Egyp. ytn “ground, earth”.

### 3.6 PROTO-IE-HS /d/

Proto-IE-HS /d/ is a voiced dental stop. It is in PIE /d/ and in PHS /d/

**3.6.1** Proto-IE-HS word [dabar-] “be strong”, a compound of two elements: a proot [da’-] “make” (§2.1.6.5 above) and stem [bar-].

IE: Ir. dibrim “to chase”, Grk phtheirō “to destroy”, Alb. dbar id. IECD, 134.

HS: Akk. dubburu “to chase”; mun-dabru “strong”, Aram. *dbr* “to lead”, Hatra, Palm. *dbr* “to lead; chief, leader”, etc. (DRS III, 212), Heb. *deber*, CA *dabru* “destruction, death”: see below.

CA *barra* “be victorious, overcome, hold”; *mu-birru* “triumphant” = Skt. *bhara-* “to fight, battle”, etc., see §3.9.38 below, but CA *mu-dbiru* “defeated” and *’a-dbara* “to flee” = Ug. *dbr* id., etc. see §2.22.7.4 above.

**3.6.2** Proto-IE-HS stem [dug-] “black, darkness”

IE: Hitt. *dankuis* “black, dark”, ON. *dokker* “dark”, OS. *dunkar* id, W. *dew* (\*deg) “gloom, fog”, Grk *dnopherós* “dark”. HCG: §81.

HS: CA *duġna-tu* “black” also “darkness”; *’idġauġana* “be dark”, *daġanu*, *daġnu*, “fog”; *mu-dġanu* “foggy”, with r-ext. as in some IE words: *daiġūru* “darkness”: Ug. *m-dg-t* “dark (place)”, CA *duġġa-tu* “darkness”: *daġġaġa* “to cover”. See §2.1.6.5.4 above.

**3.6.3** Proto-IE-HS stem [daga’-] “to shape, form”

IE: Skt. *dih-* “to smear”, Lat. *figulō*, *ġingō* “to shape, mold”, Toch. *tsek* “to shape”, OLith. *žiedmi*, Lith. *žiedziu* “fashion on potter’s wheel”. WP. I, 833; IECD, 180; SS: §12.51

HS: Egyp. *dgdg* “to plate”, with l-ext. as in Lat.: CA *daġala* “to smear (usu. with ‘tar’)” also “to gild”. See §2.1.6.5.8 above and bear in mind that notion of ‘*form, shape*’ is expressed by [ga’-] alone (§2.17.83 above), while [da-] = “cause, make” in both IE and HS languages.

**3.6.4** Proto-IE-HS stem [daga’-] “wall”. In IE, except Slavic, the root is \*dagaW- by metathesis. In HS the stem is [gadaW-]. The stem may be from [da-gaW-] “form, shape” above or, *much more likely*, from [ga-] (§2.17.83 above) plus [da-] “house, wall” (see §2.1.6.5.25, n. 4 above).

IE: Ved. *dehī-* “wall, mound”, OPers. *didā-* “fortress”, Av. *uzdaēzi-* “wall”, OCS. *zīdū* “wall”, Bulg. *zid*, Cz. *zed* id. SS: §7.27; IECD, 179; WP. I, 833ff.

HS: CA *ġaddu* “wall”, Ge. *gādgād* id., Tne. *gidgidda*, Amh. *gādgādda*, Kam. *gāggādda*, Som. *gidāngid* id., Har. *gidāgād* also *digādag* “wall” (HED, 68).

With r-ext.: CA *gidāru* ~ *guduru* (also *gaḍru* ?) “wall”, Akk. *gadaru* “belt”, Heb. *gāḍēr*, Eth. *gudur*, Min. *gdr* “wall” (DRS III, 102). It seems that [gdr] came into existence long after the establishment of [dwr] (see §3.7.55.2 below) as an autonomous root.

**3.6.5** Proto-IE-HS stem [da''aq] “to show”, a compound of [da'] ‘*cause, make*’ and [’aq] ‘*see*’ as in CA \*’aḱ- (\*tḱ): see §2.10.14, n. f, under *Comments* I above.

IE: Grk *deiknūmi* “I show”, OHG. *zeigōn* “to show”, Skt. *dicāti* “shows”, Av. *dis-* “to show”, OIr. *im-decim* “to look around”, Lat. *in-dex* “pointer”, Hitt. *tekkuššami* “I show”. SS: §15.55.

HS: CA *daḱḱa* “to show”; CII *daḱḱaḱa* “to examine closely, scrutinize”, Egyp. *degg* “to see, look” and also “to examine, scrutinize”, etc.

**3.6.6** Proto-IE-HS stem [gid-] “kid” > PIE \**dig-* by metathesis.

IE: OE. *ticcen* “kid”, OHG. *ziga* “goat”: Arm. *tik* “leather bag”. IECD, 147.

HS: Ug. *gdy* “kid” (UG, 533), Phoen. *gdy id.* (PG, 93), CA *gidā’u*, pl., *id.*

**3.6.7** Proto-IE-HS stem [dal-], seen in IE and HS with a number of related notions. The basic notion is prob. “to stretch”, developed into “to cover” through “a stretched object used as a cover”. These meanings in the order just given are preserved partly in CA [dal], but intact in caus. [sadal] as in *sadala* “to stretch” = *dalla id.* (also *dalla*, *ta-dallala* “to slacken, make loose”, Heb. *dll* “be slack, languid” (OT, 226); CA *sadūlu* “a piece of cloth used to cover the palanquin”; CIV *’asdala* “to cover, let the curtain down”; *sadīlu* “tent” = OE. *teld* “tent, curtain, cover”, ON. *tjald id.*

Some other derivatives of [dal-] are: CA *daldala* “to swing, oscillate, sway, dangle”; *daldala-tu* “swinging, oscillating, swaying”, Heb. *dālal* “to swing, wave to and fro” (OT, 225) = IE: OE. *tealtian* “to sway”, Skt. *dōlita-* “swaying”, etc. WP. I, 809.

Assyr. *dullu* “work, task, service” (King, 1898: 343) = IE: OCS. *dělo* “work, deed”, OE. *tilian* “to work, till”.

With *θ*-ext.: CA *dalaθa* “to go forward at the same rate of steps”; CVII *’indalaθa* “go at a great speed” = OHG. *zēltari* “pacing riders”, OS. *teldari id.*, MHG. *zēlten* “to pace”. IECD, 139.

**3.6.8** Proto-IE-HS word [vb *dalh-*, n. *dulh-*] “pain, trouble”

IE: Lat. *doleō* “sorrow”; *dolor* “pain, grief, sorrow”: Skt. *dal-* “to burst”. SS: §16.31; WP. I, 810.

HS: Assy. *dalāhu* “trouble”; *dalihtu* “disturbance”; *šu-dluhu* “to confound, destroy” (King, 1898: 343), CA *dalhamu* “serious illness”; *dilhamu* “burden”, Har. *dālāḥa* “to err, sin”; *’addālaḥa* “to attack repeatedly”, Ms., Go. *tā-dalla(m)*, S. *tā-dālā*, Z. *dālā* “sin, err”, Cush.: Ga. *dil* “sin, offence” (HED, 56).

**3.6.9** Proto-IE-HS stem [dum] “house”, fr. an earlier [dū- or duw-]. As a vb, [dam-] “to construct, fix together” also (later) “to cover; darkness, etc.” as in Grk *démō* “to suit, fit, build”, Goth. *ga-timan* “be fitting”, OHG. *zeman id.*, Skt. *dhaman* “fixed abode”, etc. = CA *damma* “to fix together”; *dimma-tu fem.* “pen” also “area near or about a house”; *diman*, pl., “traces or remnants in a place indicating that people and their cattle were living in it”, Egyp. *dmy* “to tie together, bring together, gather together”; *dmy* “town, village”, *dmy’* “fortress”.

IE: Grk *dómos* “house”, Lat. *domus* id., Skt. *dama-*, OCS *domŭ* id.: PIE *\*domu/o-* *\*dem-*. IECd, 141; WP. I, 786ff; SS: §7.12.

HS: [dum-], with various exts “house”. With s-ext. as in Grk-Lat. words: CA *dimāsu* “bathroom, dungeon, prison”, Syr. *dumsā* “house”, etc. See §2.3.25, n. 4-8 above.

**3.6.10** Proto-IE-HS stem [dam-] with various exts “to cover”, fr. [dum-] “a cover, anything that covers” as in CA *damama* “to cover” < *mu-dau-win* “covered”.

IE: OE. *dimm* “dim, dark, evil”, ON. *dimmr* id., OIr. *dem* “dark, black”, Lith. *diṁnas* “queer”. IECd, 182, 183; WP. I, 851.

HS: Akk. *damāšu* “to cover”; *dumš-* “roof”, Ge. *damsa* “to cover, hide” (DRS IV, 277), CA *dāmisu* “dark”: *damasa* “to hide, cover, bury”, with n-ext.: Ge. *dām(m)āna*, Har. *dāna* “cloud”, Tna. *dāmmāna*, Amh., Arg. *dammāna*, Č, E., Gt. *dabāra*, En. *damāra*, etc. id., Cush. *dum*, *tum* “be black” (HED, 57).

**3.6.11** Proto-IE-HS stem [dap-] “press down”

IE: OHG. *zispen* “to trample, pound”, Grk *depsēō* “to knead”, Arm. *tpem* (fr. *\*deps*): id., *topem* “to stamp”, OCz. *deptati*, Pol. *deptac* “to trample, tread”. IECd, 140f, 168; WP. I, 786.

HS: CA *dāfafa* “to push”; *daffa* “to give the finishing stroke, kill”, En., Č, Gt. *defāfā* “to press down”, Te. *gef abälä* “to beat”, Amh. *däffa* “throw on the ground, use force” (DRS IV, 300; HED, 54).

**3.6.12** Proto-IE-HS stem [dar-] “to run”

IE: Skt. *dru-* “to run”, Av. *dru-* id., Goth. *trudan* “to tread, step”. SS: §10.48.

HS: Akk. *darāru* “to move about freely” (DRS 4, 319), Heb. *\*drr* “to flow freely”, hence *dərōr* “swift flight, free course, flowing” (OT, 233, 235), CA *darra* “to run” also “to flow”, Som. *durdur* “to follow”.

**3.6.13** Proto-IE-HS word [darm-] “to run”, fr. an ext. of [dar-] “run” above.

IE: Skt. *drem-*, *dram-* “to run about”, Grk *édramon* “to run”, OE. *trem* “footstep”. IECd, 160; WP. I, 796; Meillet, *Introd.* 147.

HS: CA *darima* “to run with short quick steps”, Sab. *drm* “to allow (a beast) to stray” (SD, 36).

**3.6.14** Proto-IE-HS word [darg-] “step; to walk”, fr. [dar-] “run” above

IE: Goth. *þragjan* “to run”, OE. *þrægan* id.: Ir. *droch* “wheel”, Arm. *durn* “potter’s wheel”. SS: §10.48.

HS: Jp., Syr., Mand. *dargā* “step”, SA: Jib. *dorog* “to walk”, Mih., Soq. *drg* “step” (DRS IV, 308), CA *darağa* “to proceed, walk”; *darūgu* “fast”; *darrāğa-tu* “go-cart, baby walker, wheel”; *darağa-tu* “step”.

**3.6.15** Proto-IE-HS word [dard-], fr. an ext. of [dar-] “run” above

IE: Goth. *trudan* “to tread” above, ON. *troða* “to tread, press”, Alb. *drudh* “to crush”, *drudhe* “crump”, Mlr. *druidim* “to shut, force, push, drive”. IECd, 161.

HS: CA dardama “to go back and forth”, dardaba means both “to subjugate, humiliate” also “to run like someone who is afraid”.

**3.6.16** Proto-IE-HS word [dar’-], with exts “to run”, from [dar-] “run” above

IE: Skt. drā-, dadrā- “to run”, Grk apo-dirāskō “to run away”, didrāskō “to run”. Meillet, Introd, 147.

HS: CA ’i-ddara’a, CVII ’in-dara’a “to progress forward, move forward” as in Poet.

«’amāma (’a)r rakbi tandari’u ’indirā’ā»

With ʔ-ext.: darʔa’a (fr. \*dar’aʔa by metathesis) “to run away, hasten”, with labial (f/b-) ext.: dar’afa, dar’ba “to run about freely”.

**3.6.17** Proto-IE-HS word for “dwarf” in Egyp. dīrg’ id. It is also seen in OE. dwerg, ON. dvergr, OHG. twërg id., etc. IECD, 227.

**3.6.18** Proto-IE-HS word [duruš-] “trample, make solid”

IE: Lith. sū-drus “solid”, Gaul. drusus “firm, solid”. IECD, 162.

HS: Akk. durušu “foundation, base”: darāsu “to trample, tread, oppress”, CA darasa “to trample, tread”; ma-drusu “well trodden and paved (of a road)” (DRS IV, 316), Heb. dāraš “to tread with the feet”, Syr. drš “to tread or beat a path” (OT, 235).

#### Comments

Unless it can be scientifically proved to be a constituent element of a proot, *final* /-r/ in any stem (or traditional root) is orig. a proot; *medial* /-r-/ in any word (or traditional root) is either a Proto-IE-HS *infix* or proot. These two rules also apply to /l/, /n/ and /m/. For example, [drs] above comes directly from dāsa “to tread firmly under foot, thresh” as a n. dausu < dāθa: see §2.15 above. Accordingly, all IE-HS words above and those in §3.6.24 below are based on one proot.

In accordance with the unequivocal statement made above, all words cited in this research with medial or final /r/ are derived from either (a) *earlier proots without* /-r-/ or (b) *are compounds of two proots, the 2<sup>nd</sup> of which is proot* [r]. For example, [darad-] (§3.6.14 above) and [darag-] (§3.6.15 above) may have developed from daW- + -Wad (see §2.4.31) and daW- + -Wag- respectively, or from daW- + -ra- ~ -War-.

The notion of ‘family’ as it applies to *related languages* can also be applied to traditional roots, hence [bag-] “to shine” also “to utter” (see §§3.9.14b & 3.9.14c below), [balag-], [bal-] “to shine, to speak” (§§3.9.16 & 3.9.17 below), [barag-], [bar-] “to shine” (§3.9.27 below), etc. are members of one ‘proot family’.

If one knows, for example, the IE *traditional roots*, *Rule 1* above enables him to predict ‘infixes’ (or infixed /l, n, m/) in such roots. For example, Skt. dṛc- “to look”, OIr. drech “appearance, aspect”, W. drych “mirror”, OE. torht, OHG. zoraht “bright”, etc. are all, with infixed /-r-/, from the root in Skt. dić- “to show”, i.e. “cause + see” (§3.6.5 above). Whether CA daraka, CIV ’adraka “to perceive, to realize” is or is not cognate will be left for a future discussion. The very same phenomenon is seen in HS and has already been illustrated and explained in Chapter II, e.g. CA ʔt “cut, cut the tip of, sharpen” ~ ʔrt “cut a piece from”, ʔtm “cut the tip of (with the mouth) ~ ʔrtm “cut a

piece of (with the mouth, esp. when used with goats and sheep as *subject*), γz “pierce with a needle” ~ γrz id., etc.

For what concerns initial [r-], it is either a proot or a particle, esp. *prep.*, in IE-HS. See, for example, §3.12.25 below. The same applies to [m, n, l]. For additional information, see §3.15.20, under *Comments* below.

**3.6.19** Proto-IE-HS stem [dw-(s/r-/n-)] “bad, evil, ill-, mis-”, fr. an ext. of a proot \*dau- in CA *dā* “defect, fault”, *dawiy* “unfit, unsuitable”, etc.

IE: Grk *dus-* “bad, ill-, mis-”, o-dune, *dunē* “grief, misery”, Skt. *dur-*, *dus-*, Av., OPers. *dus-*, Gaul. *du-*, OBr. *do-*, Goth. *tuz-* id. IECD, 169; SS: §16.72; WP. I, 816.

HS: Egyp. *dw* “be bad; bad, evil”, *dw-ty* “evil man”, Kab. *dau* “down, beneath”, CA with n-ext.: Ug. *dn* (\*dwn) “baseness” (UG, 530), CA *dūn* (r. dwn) “mean, bad” also “down” (whence OE *dūn* “down”), Mand. *dn* “be low, lowly, abased, submissive” (MD, 112).

**3.6.20** Proto-IE-HS proot [dā-, dai-] “day”, derived fr. the same root as [dai-] “to shine” below.

IE: Lat. *diēs* “day”, Skt. *dive* id., OIr. *dia*, “day, god”, W. *dydd*, OCor. *det*, Br. *deiz* “day”, Lith. *diena* “day”, Arm. *tiw* id., Alb. *divet* “it dawns”. IECD, 148ff; SS: 14.41; CCG: §6.2; WP. I, 772f.

HS: Egyp. *dw*’ “the morning”; *dw’it* “the dawn, the early morning”; *Dw’w* “a lion-god, symbol of “To-day” (EHD II, 870); *Dw’i-ti* “god of the morning” = CA *h-dy* (see §2.4.15 above): (’al-) *Hadī* “God” (’al = the); *hu-dā* “daylight”; as a verb, *hadā* or *hadaya* “to show, point out, shine upon” = Skt. *dyut-* “to shine”, etc.

**3.6.21** Proto-IE-HS stem [dai-] “god”, related to \*dai- “day, to shine” above

IE: Skt. *dyaus*, *devas* “god”, Lat. *deus*, Osc. *deivai*, OPruss. acc. *deiwan*, Lith. *dēvas* OIr. *dīa*, Gaul. *dēvo-* id., OW. *duiu-it* “god-head”: PIE \**dyeu-*, *deiwas*, \**dei-*, etc. Meillet. Introd. 359; IECD, 150; CCG: §16; WP. I, 772; SS: §22.12

HS: Egyp. *Dw*’ *’nw* “a god”, orig. ‘*almighty god*’, fr. a compound of *dw*’ “god” + *’n-* “mighty” (cf. CA *’unwa-tu* “by force”), with n-ext.: Akk. *dayānu* “judge” (AG, 71), CA *daiyānu* “God”; *diyāna-tu*, *dīnu* “religion”, Syr. dyn, Har., Arg., Gour. *dīn*, Te. *din* id., Akk. *dīnu* “verdict, rule” (DRS IV, 245-246): comp. OPers. *dīn-* “religion”, Av. *daēna-* id., Arm. *den* id.

**3.6.22** Proto-IE-HS stem [da’-] “to give”, related to the word for “god”: cf. CA *hdy*, with prefixed caus. *h-*, “to shine, daylight, god” and also “to give (a present)”.

IE: Skt. *dā-* “to give”, Av. *dā-* id., Lat. *dās* “thou give”, Hitt. *dā-* “take”. IHL: §41c; WP. I, 814; IECD, 152f.

HS: Egyp. *d*’ “to give”, also *d*, *t* id.; *d’-t* “gift” = Av. *dāitis* “gift”, Skt. *dadātis*, with reduplication, “gift”, Lat. *dōtis*, gen. sg., id. See §2.11.6 above.

**3.6.23** Proto-IE-HS proot [dau-] “two”



IE: Hier-Hitt. *tuwai* “two”, Skt. *dvau*, Gr. *dúo*, Lat. *duo*, OIr. and common Cel. *dau*, Goth. and common Germ. *twai*, OCS. *dva*, Lith. *du id.* IECD, 171ff.

HS: Egyp. *dw* “five”, CA *ṭawā*, *daw-*, *zaw-*, *ḏau-* “two, pair”. see §2.17.20-23 above.

It is possible that CA *daulaḡu* “a house inside a house, i.e. *two houses* (in one)” meant orig. “two *lag-*, i.e. *shelters*” (§3.13.5 below). Sibawayh treats [dau-] as variant of prefixed [tau-], paying no attention to the obvious signification of the word.

**3.6.24** Proto-IE-HS false proot [dau- or dā-], with an earlier  $\theta$ -ext., seen in the Ved. word below, “to trample, thresh” as well as in CA *dāḡa* or *dayaḡa* arch.; CII *daiyaḡa* = *dāsa* below. It appears that the real proot is  $*\theta a-$ , that  $*dā-$  is caus., and that the proot was preserved in IE only in Ved. See §2.15, esp. n. 1a above.

IE: Lith. *džiauju*, -ti “to thrash”, Ved. *dyotayāmi* “to break”, Skt. *dyaumi* “to attack”. IECD, 150.

HS: Akk. *dāšu* “to tread under foot, destroy”, Syr., Jp. *dāš* “to trample” (DRS IV: 242), Heb. *dāš* “to beat, bruise in pieces, tread, thresh” (OT, 219), CA *dāsa* “to tread firmly under foot, trample, thresh”, Man. *duš* “to tread on, trample” (Leslau, MD, 106).

**3.6.25** Proto-IE-HS stem [da’-] “to burn; fire”

IE: Skt. *du-* “to burn”, Grk *daíō* “to light, kindle”, OIr. 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. *attai* “kindles”. SS: §1.85; IECD, 133f; WP. I, 768.

HS: Egyp. *d’* “fire, flame”.

Stem [da’-] above is a cpd of caus. [da’-] and a proot [’au-] “fire”. See §2.17.1 above.

**3.6.26** Proto-IE-HS proot [dai-] “to divide, break”

IE: Skt. *day-* “to divide; share” also *dā-* id. Av. *day-* id., Grk *daíō*, Alb. *daj id.* IECD, 131; WP. I, 763.

HS: Egyp. *ty* “to break”; *ty-t* “share”, Cop. *to id.* CA  $*day-$  or  $*dā-$  “to divide, cut, break”, preserved intact in the instr. fem. *mi-dya-tu* “knife”, with  $\mathfrak{h}$ -ext.: *dāḡa* or *dayaḡa* “to divide”.

**3.6.27** Proto-IE-HS proot [dai-] “time”, the same as [dai-] “divide” above.

IE: Arm. *ti* “age, year, time”, with d-ext.: OE. *tīd*, ON. *tīð*, OHG. *zīt* “time”, with m-ext.: OE. *tīma*, ON. *tīm* “time”. IECD, 148; SS: §14.11.

HS: Egyp. *ty* “time”. The proot [dai-] is also seen in Egyp. *m dt* (with unexpected /d-/ “when”, i.e. “what time”, where *m* = “what” (Aram., CA., Syr., Heb., etc. *m* “what”) and *dt*, fr.  $*dy-t$ , “time”. It is also seen in Sem., but with /t/ instead of  $*d$ , as in Assy. *matī*, CA *matā* “what time, when”, where *ma* = “what” and *-ti/ta* = “time” (see §2.20.1 above). It is also seen in CA *dā’im* “everlasting”.

**3.6.28** Proto-IE-HS word [wad’-] “to know” and word [ḡady-] “to see”.

In IE these two phonemically and etymologically different roots fell together as one form  $*weid-$ . The same phenomenon is seen in some HS languages which have lost laryngeals: cf. Assy. *īdū* or *ēdū* expresses both “to see” and “to know” (King, 1898: 333).

IE: Grk *eidon* “to see”, *oîda* “to know”, Skt., Av. *vid-* “to know”, Goth., OE., OS. *witan* id., Lat. *vidēre* “to see”, OCS. *viděti* id., *věděti* “to know”: PIE *\*weid-* “to see” and “to know”. SS: §§15.51, 17.17; WP. I, 236ff; SL, 67.

HS [*wd’-*] “to know” as in Egyp. *’d’y* “one who knows”, Akk. *idū*, Ug. *yd’* “to know” (Rabin, 1975: 89, n. 45), OAram. Phoen., Heb *yd’* id. (NWSI I, 439ff), Sab. *d’*, by metathesis, “to know” (SD, 34), Meh. *weda* id., CA *’wd* (*\*wd’*), by metathesis, preserved in the deriv. *mu-’īdu* (< *\*mū-di’u* < *\*mu-wdi’u*) “one who is knowledgeable”.

HS [*ḥady-*] “to see” as in Ug. *ḥdy* id. In CA this root is preserved intact in a number of compound words, e.g. *ḥaddaḳa* {*ḥad-’aḳ*} “see (with) eye”, etc. see, §2.10.14 above.

Words below are related to [*wad’-*].

3.6.28a IE: OE. *ge-wit* “mind”, ON. *wit* “intelligence”.

HS: Egyp. *wedd* “brain”.

3.6.28b IE: OE. *ge-wītan* “to depart”.

HS: CA *wadda’a* “to depart, leave”, Aram. *yd’* “to abandon”.

### 3.6.29 Proto-IE-HS stem [*ḥad-*] “to rejoice, sing”

IE: Grk *aeido*, Att. *ádo* “to sing”. SS: §18.12.

HS: OAkk. *ḥd’* “to rejoice” (Gelb, 1961: 91), Assyr. *ḥadū* id. as a n. “joy”, Ug. *ḥdw* “to rejoice” (UG, 535), OArm. *ḥdh* “be glad” (AG, 10), CA *ḥadā* “to sing”.

### 3.6.30 Proto-IE-HS word [*’adr-*] “testicle”

IE: Skt. *anda* (*\*andra*) “testicle”, OCS. *jadro* id., OLatv. *idrs* “kernel”. SS: §4.49, IECD, 242.

HS: CA *’adra-tu*, fem., “testicle”, perh. Egyp. *ydr* “an internal part of the body”. See §2.14.9 above.

### 3.6.31 Proto-IE-HS stem [*’ad-*] “to”

IE: Phryg. *ad-* “to, at”, Lat. *ad-*, OE. *æt*, ON. *at*, Gaul., OBr. *ad-*, OIr. *ad-*, W. *add* id., OCz., Cz., Pol. *od-* id. IECD, 2; WP. I, 45.

HS: Sab. *’d* “to, at, in, till” (SD, 12), Assyr. *adi* “to, up to, until” (King, 1898: 318), OArm. *’d* “unto, until” (AG, 5), Phoen. *’d* “unto, even to” (PG, 131).

### 3.6.32 Proto-IE-HS stem [*’id-*] “hate”, as a vb *’ād-*

IE: Lat. *ōdī* “to hate”, *ōdium* “hate”, Arm. *atem* “to hate”, *ateli* “hateful” OE. *atol* “ugly, hateful”, ON. *etjast*, reflx., “to contend”. IECD, 861f; WP. I, 174.

HS: OEgy. *’t* “to hate”, CA *’ādā* “be antagonized with”; *’idā’u* “enmity, hate”, Sab. *’dy* “to commit hostile action against” (SD, 13), Heb. *’ādāh* “to attack in a hostile manner, rush upon” (OT, 752).

### 3.6.33 Proto-IE-HS word [*hidr-*] “bedroom”

IE: OCS *odrŭ* “bed”, Russ. *odr* “couch, bier”.

HS: Ug. *ḥdr* “bedroom” (UG, 535), Phoen. *ḥdr* “chamber” (PG, 100), CA *hidru* id.

### 3.6.34 Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼad-] “age”

IE: W. aed “age”, Br. oad id.

HS: Assy. adū “age, period of time” (King, 1898: 318), CA ʼādiy, adj., “old, ancient”.

Words derived from stem [ʼad-] are:

OHG. alt “old”, OE. eald id. = CA ʼld, “old” in ʼilwadu. The /-l-/ is due to dissim., and the word is orig. \*ʼidd-, i.e. CA ʼiddu “ancient, old”, becoming ʼildu.

### 3.6.35 Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼūd-] “wood”, perh. related to “age, aged” as in CA ʼaudu “aged, very old”, Akk. adū “age” above.

IE: OE., OS. wudu “wood”, OHG. witu id., Illyr. widu- “wood, tree”, Phryg. ida “wooded hill”, OIr. fid “wood, forest”, Gaul. vidu “forest”, W. gwydd “woods, trees”, Br. gwez “trees”. IECD, 1537; SS: §1.41, CCG: §6.2.

HS: CA ʼūdu [ʼwd] “wood, stick, staff”; ʼaydā-natu fem. “a strong old tree”, Egypt. ʼdi “post”, Ga. oda “a kind of tree”. The root is seen in Heb. with initial /ʼ/: ʼūdu “a wooden poker”, BAram., Syr. ʼwd id. (OT, I, 20).

### 3.6.36 Proto-IE-HS word [ʼadm-] “skin, hide”

IE: Lith. oda “skin”, Latv. ada id.

HS: CA ʼadīmu “(red) hide, pell, tanned leather”, Som. idm, pl. idn, “hide”, Ge. ʼanada, by metathesis, id. (VPHS, 79, n.16). It should be stressed that the basic meaning of CA ʼadīmu comprises two ideas: “crust (means only “the outer surface or “skin”) of the earth” plus “red/ruddy color”, i.e. *the color of the earth*, hence Heb. ʼdm “red, ruddy, earth” also “tanned skin”, Phoen. ʼdm “red”, Pun. ʼdmh “land” (NWSI I, 14-15).

### 3.6.37 Proto-IE-HS stem [mud-] “a measure”, [mad-] “to measure, consider”

IE: Goth. and common Germc. mitan “to measure”, Grk médomai “to reflect, consider”, Lat. meditārī “to reflect on”, ON. meta “to estimate”, Umb. mersuva “right”, Osc. mersto “just”, OIr. midiur “judge”: PIE \*med-. Meillet, Introd. 100; SS: §12.54; WP. II, 259; IECD, 739f.

HS: Akk. madādu “to measure”, Ug. mdd id., Heb. mādad id., Phoen. mdd id. (PG, 116), Egypt. mt “be correct, right, exact”. CA muddu “a measure”; midādu “estimate”, Kornic *midādu* (in *subhāna llāhi midādu* (ʼa)s *samāwāt*) signifies “estimation, calculation” (LA). It is most likely that [mud] is ult. from mī- “measure” plus -t/-d as in CA mītaʼ or mīdāʼ, preserved in the following neg. sentence: I don’t know *mītāʼ ~ mīdāʼ* (of) the road, i.e. I don’t know its *measure and its extent*.

### 3.6.38 Proto-IE-HS stem [mad-] “be wet, watered, flooded”, prob. orig. “flood” since it is related to \*mad- “measure”: cf. also CA maddu “flood” as well as “tide” with middādu “salty water”; mudda-tu “appointed or fixed time and place”: madda “to expand, stretch”, etc. almost all the elements associated with ‘flood’.

IE: Lat. madēre “be wet”, Grk madāō id.; mastós “wet”, Skt. mad- “to rejoice”: PIE \*mad-. IECD, 724; WP. II, 230.

HS: Egyp. mt “inundation”, Ga. mada “water”:  
For Skt. mad- “to rejoice” above = Egyp. mt’ id.

**3.6.39** Proto-IE-HS stem [mad-] “cake, food”, perh. unrelated to [mad-] above: see §2.10.20 above.

IE: Doric mádda “cake”, Goth. mats “food”, OE. mete, OHG. maz id.: Skt. medas “fat”: PIE: mad-. IECD, 724; SS: §5.12; WP. II, 232.

HS: Egyp. mt’ “cake”, CA madīdu “fodder”, Ga. midan “food”.

**3.6.40** Proto-IE-HS word [matsiyu-] “fish”. *Is it a compound of \*mad- and \*šiyu- “fish”?*

IE: Skt. matsya- “fish”, Av. masya- id.: PIE \*mad- in Lat. madēre “be wet”, etc. SS: §3.65; WP. II, 230.

HS: Egyp. mst’ “a measure for fish”. *Is it from \*mst’ or \*mtsy by metathesis? Is it related to CA šiyam or šīm “a kind of fish”?* It seems that the CA word is from šay’u “water” = Goth. saiws “lake”, OHG. sēo “sea”, etc., and that its final /-m/ is a plural marker.

**3.6.41** Proto-IE-HS \*mad- “period of time”, related to \*mad- “measure” above.

IE: OCS. madītī “delay, linger”; madinu “slow”, Skt. manda-, with infixal nasal, “lazy”.

HS: CA mudda-tu “period of time”<sup>301</sup>, madda “to prolong, lengthen” also “procrastinate, postpone”, Sab. mdd “period” (SD, 83).

**3.6.42** Proto-IE-HS stem [nad-] “bind”, fr. a proot [nau-] and [-d-]. See §2.11.88 above.

IE: Skt. nah- (\*nadha- < \*nada-) “to bind”, Ir. nascim id., Lat. nōdus “knot”, Goth. and common Germ. nati “net”, Icel. noti also “match, equal”: PIE \*ned-. IECD, 848; WP. II, 328; SS: §9.16; SL: 80.

HS: Egyp. ned, nedd “to bind”, Assy. nadū “to found, set (a dwelling)” (King, 1898: 366), CA nādī “club”, a deriv. of nadā “to join together”.

For Icel. noti above, CA naddu “match, equal”.

**3.6.43** Proto-IE-HS stem [nad-] “stream, dew”,

IE: Skt. nadī- “water, river”, Goth. natjan “moisten”, OHG. naz “wet”, OS. nat “wet”, Du. nat id.: PIE \*nad-. IECD, 825; SS: §1.36.

HS: Egyp. net “stream”, Shil. ndu “be wet” (Applegate, 1958: 62), CA nadā “dew”: CA nadiy, ta-nadda “be wet, moist”.

Indoeuropeanists connect IE root \*nad- above with \*nad- “to roar, shout” as in Skt. nad- “to roar, sound” = Assy. nadū “to raise a cry” (King ibid), Sab. ndy “to proclaim, declare” (SD, 91), CA nādā “to call, shout, cry out”.

**3.6.44** Proto-IE-HS word [ra’d-] “branch”

---

<sup>301</sup> The addition of /’-/ creates a new triliteral, hence ’amadu “end of one’s time” (Koran, 57: 16).

IE: Lat. *rādix* “root”, *rāmus* (\**rādmōs*) “branch”, Grk *rādī-* id.: OE. *wyr̥t* “to plant”, OHG. *wurz* id. EM. 563, SS: §8.54.

HS: CA *ra’du* “branch”: Egyp. *’yr’d* “to plant”. Both Grm. and Egyp. words have the caus. prefix /’-/.

### 3.6.45 Proto-IE-HS stem [rut- ~ rud-] “mankind”

IE: OCS. *rodŭ* “clan, tribe, family”, Bulg., Russ., Cz., Pol. *rod* “family, race, generation”.

HS: Egyp. *ret* “mankind, men” = CA *rattu* “master of the people”, pl. *rutūtu. raḥtu*, with infix -h-, “tribe, clan, family”, Sab. *rhṭ* “family member” (SD, 116).

CA and Sab. words are from a stem \**rad-* as a verb “to help, assist, follow” and as a noun “helper, follower”: cf. Sab. *rd* “helper, to help, assist”, CA *rid’u* “helper, follower”: *rada’a* “to help, aid, protect, defend”, OAkk. *rdy* “to follow” (Gelb, 1961: 192), Phoen. *rd* “chief” (Harris, PG, 145). CA-Sab. *raḥtu* is from \**rahdu* < *rad-*, and the change of \**-d-* to \**-ṭ-* is for ease of pronunciation. The sequence \**rahdu* is not permitted.

### 3.6.46 Proto-IE-HS word [ward-] “rose”

IE: Av. *vareḏa-* “rose”, Grk, with loss of initial \*/*wa-*/, *rōdon* “rose”.

HS: Egyp. *wyr̥t* “rose”, CA *warda-tu* fem. “rose”, derived fr. *wardu* “red-yellow”.

With various exts: CA *warahu* “a kind of plant with small brownish leaves”, Sem. \**wrḥ* “moon” (Phoen., OAram., Heb. *yrḥ*, Ug. *yrḥ*, etc. = CA *tārīḥ* (ta-*wrīḥ*) “date”) is perh. fr. “pale, yellow”.

CA *warḥu* “(green) leaves”, Heb. *yārāk* “green (herbage, etc.)” (OT, 425), OAram. *yrḥ* “verdure, vegetables”, *yrḥn* “yellowness”, OAkk. *jarḫānu* “a certain type of garden-herb” (NWSI I, 471).

Egyp *wrḥ* “green”, *wrs* “herb” = CA *warsu* “a yellow plant, a kind of dye”, etc.

3.6.47 Proto-IE-HS word [wadn/r-] “water”, in Skt. *ud-* id., CA *wadā* “to flow”, Sab. *wdy/-w* id.; *ydynn* “to water a place”. The root is also seen with initial /’-/ instead of /*w-*/ as in Egyp. *’d* “dew”, Akk. *edū* “flood”, Heb. *’ēd* “flot souterrain”. See §2.11.4 above.

IE: Lith. *wanduo* “water”, Latv. *udens* id., Skt. *uden-* id., Lat. *unda* “wave”, Hitt. *watar* “water”, Goth. and common Germ. *wato* id., OCS and common Sl. *voda* id. SS: §1.31; IECD, 1474, 1574; WP. I. 252f.

HS: Egyp. *wḏn* “stream, flood”, Sab. *wḏn* “be flood-irrigated”, CA *wadana* “moisten, make wet”; *wadīnu* “moist, wet” also “rain”; *widānu* “watered place”.

### 3.6.48 Proto-IE-HS stem [sad-] “to sit”

IE: Lat. *sedēre* “to sit”, Skt. *sad-*, Lith. *sēdėti* id., Hitt *sāstas* “bed”, Lat. *sēdēs* “seat, place”, OPers. *hadis* “seat”, Grk *hédos* id., Skt. *sadas* “seat, abode”, OFris. *sēta* “home”, OE. *setl* “seat, settle”. PIE \**sed-*, *sēd-*. IECD, 1115ff; SS: §12.13; WP. II, 483f.

Burrow (SL, 87) reconstructs PIE \**sad-H-*, this is = CA *sadaḥa* “to dwell, settle”; *’insadaḥa* “lie down”.

I reconstruct [θau-] “to sit”; [θūt-] “seat”; θātāt- “bed”; caus. [’aθ-] “cause + sit” as in Sk. as-, CA ’aθ- id.: see §3.11.42 below.

HS: Egyp. st “seat” = CA suddā-tu “seat”, and this meaning extends to “throne” as in اعلى سدة الملك أو الحكم. It also means “a bed” also “shed” (cf. OCS. selo, fr. \*sedlo, “tent”, etc.) as well as “hall”. See §§2.9.18 & 2.12.14 above.

**3.6.49** Proto-IE-HS stem [dar-] “tree”, fr. an earlier [duw-] seen in CA duwā-dimu, etc. (see §2.7.20 above). There is still an arch. word difficult to pronounce *dāḏīnu* pl. “lighthouse made from wild pomegranate trees (= *madḏu*)”, consisting of \*da- and -ḏe-, any of which could be a term for “tree” without violating the common word order.

IE: Skt. dāru- “wood”, Grk dóru id., Goth. triu “tree”, ON. trē id., Ir. dair, daur “oak”, OCor. dar id. CCG: §67.

HS: CA redupl. form dardāru “kind of tree”, BHeb. dardar “thorny plant”. Egyp. tr-t “willow tree” is not cognate; it is variant of θr-t id. = CA sarwu coll. “willow tree”. It is evident that CA /s-/ here is definitely from /θ-/.

**3.6.50** Proto-IE-HS stem [dub-] “bottom”

IE: OCS dūno (\*dub-no) “bottom”, Lith. dubus “deep”, Goth. diups id., Ir. domain (\*dub-), id., domun (\*dub-no) “world”. SS: §12.3.

HS: Egyp. db “sole of the foot”, Cush.: Ga. dibu “valley”.

### 3.7 *PROTO-IE-HS /ḏ/*

Proto-IE-HS /ḏ/, a voiced dental lateral. It is in PIE /dh/ and in PHS /ḏ/

#### 3.7.1 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḏab-, ḏabb-, ḏabḏab-] “to strike, beat”

IE: OE. *dubbian* “to strike”, Sw. *dubba* id., OCz. *debšu* “to beat”. IECD, 214.

HS: Egyp. *ḏb*, *ḏbḏb* “to pierce, stab; spear, javelin”, CA *ḏubāḏibu* “strong, daring”. With *’*-ext.: Sab. *ḏb’* “to fight, wage war; battle, army” also “to smite enemy” (SD, 40), Heb. *šābā* “to go to war; war, army” (OT, 879), CA *ḏaba’a* “to hold, retain, take to prison; strong, mighty, able”; etc.

#### 3.7.2 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḏib- or ḏub-] “stout”

IE: OPruss. *debīkan* “big”, OCS. *debelū* “stout”, ON. *dapr* “heavy”, OHG. *tapfer* “firm, durable”

HS: CA *ḏibrāku* or *ḏubāriku* “tall, bulky and heavy” also “courageous”, *ḏubāri-m* id.: *ḏabaru* “stout”.

#### 3.7.3 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḏab-] “be timid, fearful”

IE: Lith. *dabus* “timid”, Skt. *-dābhyah* “frivolous”, Alb. *i bodë* “weak”, OE. *dapr* “weak, faint”, Goth. *af-dobnan* “grow dumb”. IECD, 175.

HS: Egyp. *ḏb* “timid, fearful”: CA *ḏaba’a* “to blush, be ashamed or blushful”.

#### 3.7.4 Proto-IE-HS word [ḏubis-] “fierce, ill-natured”

IE: Skt. *dubhis* “dashing, wild”, Ir. *dod* “anger”. IECD, Suppl. 1613.

HS: CA *ḏabisu* “fierce, ill-natured, ill-tempered”, *mu-ḏibbu* “angry and rancorous”: *ḏabbu*, *ḏibbu* “anger, grudge”.

#### 3.7.5 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḏab-] “decorate; skillful” < [ḏab-] “finger, hand” (§2.17.38, n. 1a & 2.1.10, n. 7-8 above)

IE: Lith. *dabinti* “to decorate, adorn”, Lat. *faber* “skilful”, Goth. *ga-daban* “be fitting, to happen”, OE. *dafen* “fit, proper, good”, Toch. A *täppo* “fitness, valor”. IECD, 174.

HS: Egyp. *ḏb*, *ḏb’* “to decorate”,

With *r*-ext.: CA *ḏabara* “to arrange, stick together”,

With *ṭ*-ext., *ḏabbaṭa* “to fix” also “be able to work with the left hand so easily as the right (i.e. *be skillful, fitting*)”,

With *θ*-ext.: Palm. *ṣbt* “to decorate, ornament”, etc. see §2.17.38, n. 1a above.

#### 3.7.6 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḏab-] “be foggy”

IE: Grk *θambós* “dim; dimness”, Arm. *damarin* “get confused”, OHG. *dampf* “stem”. IECD, 177.

HS: CA ḍabābu “fog”; ḍabāba-tu “steam”: ḍabba, ’aḍabba “be foggy”.

### 3.7.7 Proto-IE-HS word “to burn”

IE: Skt. dahati “burns”, Av. dažaiti id., Toch. tsäk- id., Lith. degti, OCS. žešti id., Mlr. daig “fire”: PIE \*dheg<sup>wh</sup>-. SS: §1.85, IECD, 179, WP. I, 849.

HS: if IE /d-/ is *truly* from an earlier /dh-/, then the supposed HS cognate should be CA ḥaḍaga “to burn”. This correspondence presupposes that IE has lost an initial /h/, and that IE words above are from the same root as those in §3.7.8 below, but with different exts. No evidence has been found to support this analysis.

A more cogent analysis of IE words is that the word is a compound of caus. [da’] plus [’ag<sup>wh</sup>] (§2.5.8 above).

### 3.7.8 Proto-IE-HS word [ḥaḍa’-] “to kindle”

IE: Skt. ṛdh- “to kindle”, Grk αἶθε “to kindle, burn”, αἶθος “heat, fire”, Lat. aestus “heat”, Mlr. aed “fire”. SS: §1.85; IECD, 5f; WP. I, 4ff; Meillet, Introd. 136.

HS: CA ḥaḍa’a “to kindle a fire, burn”, Egyp. ḥḏ “to shine, illumine”, Ga. hada “to stir the fire”.

### 3.7.9 Proto-IE-HS word [ḍagir] “annoyed”

IE: degerim “lounge”, W. daer “slow”, Fris. digerje “to stare”: PIE \*dhegheh-. IECD, Suppl. 1612

HS: CA ḍaḡiru “bored, annoyed, weary”: ḍaḡira “to repine, be bored, annoyed”.

### 3.7.10 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḍal-]

IE: OIr. dall “blind, dim”, W., Cor., Br. dall “blind”, LG. daseln, NE. dazzle. IECD, Suppl. 1611. Lewis and Pedersen (CCG: §17) connects the Celtic words with Goth. dwals “foolish”.

HS: CA ḍalla “going astray, wandering, lost”, Sab. ḍll “sickness” (SD, 41).

### 3.7.11 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḍam-] “join together”

IE: Grk θάμυς “compact”, Hes. θάιμός “family, household”, Goth. faur-dammjan “dam up”, etc. IECD, 189.

HS: CA ḍamma “to unite, conjoin, bind”; ’iḍmāma-tu “groups of people genetically unrelated but live together”, etc. see §2.12.16 above.

### 3.7.12 Proto-IE-HS word [ḍabbu-] > IE ḍambh-

IE: Grk taphos “stupor, amazement”, Hes. thapan “fear”, Skt. dambh- “fraud”, Goth. dumbs, OHG. tumb, OE, dumb, etc. IECD, 194.

HS: CA ḍabbu “silent (out of fear)”; ḍabbu “robber”, with s-ext.: CA ḍabīsu “stupid, coward”.

### 3.7.13 Proto-IE-HS word [ḍana’-] “to hide, cover”

IE: Ir. dion “to cover, shelter”; din “covering”, Lith. denis “deck”, etc. IECD: 163.

HS: CA ḍana’a “to hide”.



### 3.7.14 Proto-IE-HS stem [dar-] “be strong”

IE: Skt. dhṛ- “to hold, support”, Av. dar- “to hold, retain”, OPers. dar- id., Grk, Aeolic thérsoi “courage”, Lith. derus “thriving”: PIE \*dher-. IECD, 184, 198.

HS: Egyp. dry “to use strength, fortify, imprison, constrain”; ydr, caus., “make strong, fortify”, Sab. drr “to wage war”; ’drr “war” (SD, 42), CA drru “strong, mighty”, dārī “fierce”, Heb. šārar “to be hostile, press down, persecute” (OT, 907): PHS [dar-], with ‘-ext.: Sab. dr’ “to defeat, bring someone to submission”.

Related words are below:

3.7.14a IE: Skt. dhṛṣ- “to dare”, OCS drūznati “to hold”; drūzū “bold”, OE. durran “to dare”, OIr. drenn “rough”, Arm. daṛn “harsh, bitter”, Toch. tsraši “energetic”: PIE \*dhṛṣ-. IECD, 213.

HS: CA darsu “rough”; dārisu “fierce, ferocious, strong”; taḏārasa, recipr., “to battle”; dīrsu, Sab. dṛs “molar tooth”, so-called from its *strength* and *hardness*; with z-ext.: CA dīrsu “hard, strong”: dārīr “one who is strong, powerful”, Egyp. dry “strong one” as a vb “to use strength”.

Ga. diraa “harsh, cruel”, etc. may belong here or may be deriv. of HS [dar-] “be strong, dare” as in Akk. u-darra(’) “he drives”, CA ya-dra’u “he defends, drives, pushes” also “attacks”; yata-darra’u, Class V, “dares”.

### 3.7.15 Proto-IE-HS stem [darag-] “to tie up”

IE: Skt. dṛh- “to bind”, OCS. drūžati “to hold”, Av. drag- “to hold, lead”; drang- “to strengthen, make firm”, dares- “to bind, make fast”: IE \*dhergh-, dhregh-, an ext. of \*dher- as in Skt. dhṛ- “to hold, support” above. SS: §11.15.

HS: Egyp. dr “to tie up”, CA CII ’indarağa “to rush upon, to fall on (as an animal or large bird falls upon its prey)”, with ‘-ext.: darğa’u “tiger”, so-called from its *strength*.

### 3.7.16 Proto-IE-HS word [darag-] “to cut, cleave”

IE: Lith. drožiti “to cut, gash, smash”, Latv. dragāju “to beat, shatter”, drāžu “to cut, scrape, beat”, Bulg. draznja “to irritate”. IECD, 202.

HS: CA darrağa “to cleave, split”; darğa “to stain with blood”.

### 3.7.17 Proto-IE-HS stem [vb daruk-, n. durak-] “firm, strong”

IE: OPruss. drūktai “firmly”, Lith. drūktas “strong”, OE. dryge “dry”, OHG. trucchan id.: Skt. dhṛ- “hold”, Egyp. dry “use strength” above.

HS: CA daruka “be firm, strong”; durāku “lion”, so-called from its *strength*, Sab. drk “to wall a cistern around” (SD, 42).

### 3.7.18 Proto-IE-HS word [duraṭ-] “droppings, fart”

IE: ON. drit “dirt, droppings” as v. drīta, OE. ge-drītan id., Cz. dřistati “diarrhea”. IECD, 205; SS: §4. 66

HS: CA durāt “fart”.

### 3.7.19 Proto-IE-HS stem [dar-] “hurt, harm”, fr. proot [daw-] (§3.7.32 below).

IE: OFris. *dera* “to hurt, harm”, OHG. *teren* id., OE. *derian* id., Lith. *derėti* “to hit”. IECD, 198.

HS: CA *ḏarra* “to hurt, harm”, Shil. and common Berb. *duru* id., Phoen. *ṣr* “adversary” Sab. *ḏrr* “harm, damage, enemy”, Heb. *ṣar* “enemy”, Aram. *ʿar*, Eth. *ḏr* id. Egyp. *ḏr-t* “oppression, restraint”.

For the orig. of [ḏar-] see §2.6.13, n. 9-11 above and also §3.7.32 below.

### 3.7.20 Proto-IE-HS word [ḏarab-] “to strike”

IE: OE. *drepan* “to strike”, ON. *drepa* id., OHG. *treffan* “to strike, hit”, OCS. *drobiti* “to break in pieces”: PIE *\*dhrebh-*, *\*dhrobh-*. SS: §9.21, IECD, 206.

HS: CA *ḏaraba* “to strike, beat, hit, smite”, Ge. *zaraba* “batter, frapper” also “frapper les cordes d'un instrument du musique” (DRS IV, 340) = CA *ḏaraba* id. with *mi-ḏrābu* “plectrum”, Heb. *ṣārāb* “a scar, cicatrix” (OT, 905), Ga. *derba* “to toss”.

#### Comments

IE-HS words above, like others with infixed /-r-/, are derived from [ḏub-] “finger; hand”. Grm. above adopts the root vowel of the noun. In HS the root vowel of the *perfect* is /-a-/ and of the *imperf.* is *ø* (zero) as in CA *perfect*: *ḏaba’a* “to hold, retain” (actually *he held, retained.*), *imperf.* *ya-ḏba’u* “*he holds, retains*”. It is evident that Sem. does not have ‘*infinitive*’ and we use the 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. masc. sg. of the *perfect* as ‘*infinitive*’. A fact I have already drawn attention to (2.1.7.3, ft <sup>1</sup> above).

### 3.7.21 Proto-IE-HS word [ḏarab-] “to work”

IE: Lith. *dirbti* “to work, make, do”; darbas “work”, Latv. *darbs* id., OE. *deorf* “toil, trouble”, Arm. *darbnem* “to forge”. SS: §9.13; IECD, 211; WP. I, 863.

HS: CA *ḏaraba* “to earn, get” also, Koranic, “to work”, hence *ḏāribu* “worker” (LA).

### 3.7.22 Proto-IE-HS word [ḏarb-] “be disturbed, shaken”

IE: Skt. *darbhāmi* “fear”, Lith. *drebėti* “to tremble, shiver”, Latv. *drebu* id., OE. *drif* “fever”, Pers. *dirafšam* “tremble”, etc. IECD, 203, 206.

HS: CA CVIII *’idḏaraba* “be disturbed, shaken, embarrassed, trembled”; adj. *mu-ḏṭarib*.

### 3.7.23 Roto-IE-HS word [ḏarib-] “curdled milk”

IE: Grk *trophlís* “curdled milk, yogurt”, ON. *drafli* “curdled milk”, etc. IECD, 206

HS: CA *ḏaribu* “yogurt originally formed from *the milk of a least three* she-camels” also “thick white-honey”. The first meaning is a direct deriv. of CA *ḏaraba* “to mix”, while the second of CA *ḏaribu* “icy snow, ice”.

Notion of “white” as expressed by the CA words is seen in IE as in Lat. *farfugium* “white poplar”.

### 3.7.24 Proto-IE-HS word [ḏarW-] “forest”

IE: OCS. *dre-* in *dre-zga*, “forest”, Skt. *dhūrṇah* “resin”; *dhṛṇami* “grow old”, Alb. *drinjë* “brushwood”, Hes. *θrânía* “clot of blood”. IECD, 212.

HS: CA *ḏarrā'u* “thicket of trees”; *ḏarwu*, pl., described in LA as “trees growing in the mountains and are similar to oak-trees”; *ḏariya*, said of a vein, “to bleed”; *ḏārī* “bleeding vein”; *ḏirwu* “gum of a kind of tree” = Heb. *šrw* “*opobalsamum*, balsam of Gilead”, so-called because *it is distilled from a tree growing in Gilead* (OT, 905), Sab. *ḏrw* “a kind of aromatic” (SD, 42) = CA *ḏarwu*, pl. LA defines the word as “*an aromatic tree*” in an attempt to explain it in a poem of Nabīyah Alja'di: ... *ورضلا بنم شقاربوا لايه ن* ... *نثست* “*She clean her teeth with a tooth scraper-wood taken from ḏarw of Barakish and Hailān*”, two vallies in Yeman once inhabited by very ancient tribes.

For Hes. word above, CA *ḏārī* “bleeding”.

### 3.7.25 Proto-IE-HS word [ḏerm-]

IE: MHG. *türmen* “be giddy; rage, rave”, Serb. *drmam* “to shake, shudder”, Lat. *form-īdō*, etc. IECD, 212.

HS: CA *ta-ḏarrama* “be angry”: *ḏarama* “to burn”.

### 3.7.26 Proto-IE-HS stem [di'- or di'di'-] “relative, posterity”

IE: Grk *tēθis* “aunt”, *tēθē* “grandma”, OCS. *dēbū* “grandpa”, Lith. *dēdē* “uncle”, *dēdeinė* “aunt”. IECD, 178.

HS: CA *di'di'u* “posterity, progeny”. The stem, like any other stem or proot, can be expanded by adding new proots. However, some of the derivatives show an initial /ḏ-/ as in *ḏa'bu* or *ḏa'mu* “brother-in-law”, *ḏi'r-* “nurse, only in the sense: *a woman suckling childred other than her own*”; *ḏā'ara-*, said only of a nurse, “adopt and suckle an infant”, Egyp. *ḏ'm* “young men”.

### 3.7.27 Proto-IE-HS word for “to suck, suckle”

IE: Hitt. *titai-* “to suckle, nurse”, Skt. *dhā-* “to suck”, Grk *θēsθai* “be suckled”, Latv. *dēt* “to suck”, OCS. *dojiti* “suckle”: PIE \**dhē-*, *dhēi-*, etc. SS: §5.16, IECD, 180, 187, WP. I. 829f.

HS: Egyp. *t't* “to suckle, nurse”. A possible HS cognate stem [ḏay-]: see §2.10.41 above. In this case, Av. *daēnu-* “female (animal)”, Skt. *dhenu-* “cow” also “female (animal)” are not from PIE \**dhē-* above, but rather from a Proto-IE-HS word [ḏa'nu] “female of small cattle” as in CA *ḏa'nu* “sheep”, Sab. *ḏ'n*, Ug. *ṣ'n*, etc. id.

3.7.28 Proto-IE-HS word [(wa)ḏa'-] “to put, place”, the initial semivowel /w-/ appears in some derivatives and disappears in others in both IE and HS languages. In this root, as well as in all other roots in which /w-/ appears initially, /w-/ must be recognized as a grammatical element. See §2.12, n. 3-5 above.

IE: Hitt. *da-a-i*, *te-* “to put, place”, Grk *thēsō* id., Skt. *dhā-* “to put, set”, Av. *dā-*, OPers. *dā-* “to set, establish”, Toch. *tās* “to put”, Arm. *e-di* “I placed”: PIE \**dhē-*. SS: §12.12; Skeat, SOE: §220; IECD, 180f; IHL: §§51g, 63c; IH \**dhe'-*

HS: Egyp *wḏ'* “to place, put”, *de'* “to place, set”, CA *'a-ḏa'u* “I put, place, set”; *ḏa'*, impert., “put!”; *mutta-di'u* “humble”; *di'a-tu* “humiliation, lowliness” = Egyp. *ḏ't* “humiliation, Sab. *wḏ'* “to set down, humble”; *h-wḏ'*, caus., “be stationed”, Kab. *du'* “to obey”: see §2.12.13 above.

IE-HS words below are related to [da'-] "to put":

3.7.28a IE: Hitt. *tezzi* "says", OCS. *děti* "to say", Latv. *deveju* "to declare, announce".

HS: Egyp. *wḏ'* "to emit a word", PChad. \*t- "to say", CA *mu-wāḏa'a-tu* fem. "debate", Sab. *st-wḏ'* "be issued (oracle)" (SD, 157).

3.7.28b IE: OCS. *děti* "to do, make", OE. *dōn* "to do, to put", *dāed*, OS. *dād*, OHG. *tāt* "deed".

HS: CA *wāḏi'a-tu* "job, career", Sab. *wḏ'-w* "to set about a task" (SD, 157).

3.7.28 c IE: Lat. *vadis* "pledge", Goth. *wadi* id., OE. *wedd*, OFris. *wed*, Icel. *weð* id.: PIE \*wadh-. IECD, 1483, WP. I, 216.

HS: CA *wāḏi'u* subst. "trust": *wāḏa'a* "to entrust with", fr. [wāḏa'-] "put, place" (see below). Attention should be paid to the fact that '*entrust with*' is most commonly expressed nowadays by *wāḏa'a*.

Another HS root expressing a similar meaning is seen in CA *wa'du* "promise, pledge"; *wa'ada* "to promise, agree", Aram. 'dy (fr. \*w'd) "treaty, pact", Syr. *wa'da*, Heb. *ya'ad* id., Akk. *wādu* "to appoint, designate, apportion".

There is a good possibility that Proto-Sem. /w'd/ above is ultimately fr. /wḏ'/ "to put", since all meanings expressed by /wḏ'/ in Sem. languages are covered by /wḏ'/. e.g.

(1) "*treaty, pact*" (as in Aram. etc. above): CA *wāḏa't* fem. referring to war, "to stop a war";

(2) "*to agree*" (as in CA): CA *ta-wāḏa'a* id.;

(3) "*to appoint, apportion*" (as in Akk.): CA *wāḏa'i'u*, pl. with no verbal form, "shares of taxes, spoils, and tenth (on growing crops) that a pre-Islamic chief used to take" also "assignment of taxes" (LA). These facts leave no doubt that Proto-Sem. \*w'd is from \*wḏ'.

The foregoing discussion suggests that PIE \*wadh- "pledge" is cognate with PHS *wḏ'-*, also CA *wāḏi'a-tu* "mortgage"; *wāḏa'u* "bet", Sab. *wḏ'-n* "to dedicate, vow". This connection implies that IE \*wadh- is a deriv of \*dhē- "put".

3.7.28d Another important term related to [wāḏa'] expresses "to go" as the following IE-HS words show:

IE: Lat. *vādere* "to go rapidly, rush"; *wadum* "ford", OE. *wadan* "to go, wade", OFris. *wada* id., ON. *waða* "to rush, wade". IECD, 1483, SS: §10.47, WP. I, 217.

HS: CA *wāḏa'a* "cause to go fast, to run, to walk"; *wāḏ'u* "running", Sab. *wḏ'* "to go out, come out, drive out" (SD, 156). It is of importance here to see §2.10.25 above.

### 3.7.29 Proto-IE-HS proot [ḏau-] "to bind"

IE: Grk *dēw* "to bind", Skt. *dā-* id.; *dāman-* "cord, rope"

HS: CA 'in-*ḏawā* "to join", Egyp. *dw* "bandlet".

With m-ext., as in Skt., CA *ḏamma* "join together".

### 3.7.30 Proto-IE-HS root [ḏa'- or ḏau-]

IE: Lith. *dvakas* “stench”: *dvokiu*, *ti* “to stench”, Grk *sēpō* “putrefy”; *saprós* “stench”. IECD, Suppl. 1613.

HS: CA *ta-ḏauwka* “be stained, soiled, blotted”; *ḏauwaka* “to soil, stain”, Egyp. *ḏ’-t* “impurity” (see §2.6.13, n. 10-11 above).

### 3.7.31 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḏu’- or ḏau’-] “to shake”

IE: Skt. *dhū-* “to shake, agitate”, Grk *thūo* “to rage”, *thūē* “perfume”, ON. *dyja* “to shake”, Latv. *dūju* “to rage”: PIE \**dhū-*. SS: §10.30, IECD, 216f; WP. I, 837.

HS: CA *ya-ḏu’u* (*ya-* = *he*) “shakes and agitates, shakes and frightens, scares”; *ḏau’u* “perfume”; *ta-ḏauwa’a* “to spread (the smell of perfume)”, lit. ‘*perfume blows*’, Sab. *ḏw’* “alarm, state of emergency” (SD, 42).

With *n-ext.*: Egyp. *ḏ’nn* “to shake, shiver through fear”.

### 3.7.32 Proto-IE-HS proot [ḏaw-], with various ext., “be physically ill, die”

IE: Goth. *af-dauīþ* “worried to death”, OE. *dīegan* “to die”, OCS, and common Slav. *daviti* “to strangle”, Hitt. *tawatu* “let him destroy”. IECD, 201, WP. I, 223ff.

HS: CA *ḏawā* “to be physically weak, to fade”, Egyp. *ḏ’i* “pain, discomfort”. See §2.6.13, n. 9-11 above.

To the stem above belong Skt. *dhvan-* “be extinguished” and *dhvasye* “perish, fail” as well as OE. *dwīnan* “pine, waste”, etc. CA *ḏanā* (*ḏāna*) “pine away, waste, emaciate” also “incurable illness”.

### 3.7.33 Proto-IE-HS stem [vb ḏawar-, n. ḏaur-] “to hurt, kill”, fr. [ḏaw-] above.

IE: Skt. *dhvarāmi* “to hurt, kill, fell”, Hitt. *duwarna-* “to shatter”.

HS: CA *ḏāra* “to hurt, harm”; *ta-ḏauwara* “to writhe in pain from beating or hunger”; *ta-ḏauwuru* “crying from beating or hunger”, Egyp. *ḏ’r* “to act violently, overcome”, Heb. *šūr* “to press upon, to beset, to assail” (§2.6.13, n. 9-11 above).

### 3.7.34 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḏaw’-] “to shine”

IE: Grk *theō* “to shine”, Skt. *dhavalah* “glistening”. IECD, 188.

HS: CA *ḏawā*, *’a-ḏā’a* “to shine”; *’idā’atu* “lighting, lightening”, Egyp. *ḏ’tw* “to burn; fire”.

### 3.7.35 Proto-IE-HS stem [paud-, pād-] “to empty”

IE: OCS. and common Sl. *pustû*, adj., “empty, deserted”, Lat. *pausāre* “to cease”, Grk *paustéon* “be stopped”: PIE \**paustos*. IECD, 909.

HS: CA *fādi* “empty”: *fāddā* “to empty, vacate”; *’afdā* “become indigent, poor”, *fāda* ~ *fāḏa* “to die, come to an end”.

### 3.6.36 Proto-IE-HS word [paḏah-] “to break, dig, thrust”

IE: Lat. *fodere*, OCS. *bodo*, *bosti* “to stab”, Hitt. *pedahi* “to dig”, Grk *s-phdanos* “thrusting, violent”. IECD, 69, WP. II. 188.

HS: CA *paḏaḥa* “to break, rip open, gouge (eye), split”, connected with Heb. *bš’* “to cut off” by Ryder (1974: 109). The Heb. word = CA *baḏa’a id*.

**3.7.37** Proto-IE-HS stem [had-], esp. with infix -n- in some IE-HS languages, “garden, flower”

IE: Grk ános “flower”, Skt. andhas “an herb”.

HS: Egyp. hnd “garden, orchard”, CA ḥadīdu “a place rich in water and trees”.

With r-ext.: CA ḥudāru, coll. n., “vegetable”, Heb. ḥāšīr “grass, herbage”; ḥāšēr, obsl., “to be green, verdant; grass” (OT, 337, 338-339), OAram. ḥšr “grass” (AG, 3), Phoen. ḥšr “grass, plant” (PG: 104).

**3.7.38** Proto-IE-HS word [ʾard-] “earth”

IE: Goth. airþa “earth”, OE. eorþe id., OHG. erda id., OIr. ert “land”, Grk éraze “to the ground”.

HS: CA ʾarḍu “earth, land”, Phoen., Heb. ʾrṣ “earth”.

**3.7.49** Proto-IE-HS word [ḥadir-] “enclosure; house, wall, door”

IE: OE. eodor “house, dwelling”, OS. eder “fence”, ON. jaðar “edge”, OHG. etar “boundary”, Bulg. odâr “bedstead, porch”, Arm. erd “roof, house”, etc. IECD, 232.

HS: Ug. ḥḍr ~ ḥṯr “enclosure, court”, CA ḥadīra-tu fem. “enclosure, pen” also “barn”; ḥidāru “wall” (also “door”, etc. anything that separates between two things), Egyp. ḥeter “stable, stall”, ḥtrw “doorpost”, Heb. ḥšr “an enclosure court, dwelling place, village” (OT, 337-339). The root is seen in many place names, esp. in Arabic, e.g. CA ḥadramaut “Hadarmaut”, perh. ‘house of *maut*, i.e. *death*’.

**3.7.40** Proto-IE-HS stem [ḥeḍ-] “white, bright”

IE: Grk aithérios “bright”; aithrinós “of early morning”, Sequanian aidrini “bright”, Lith. jedra “measles” etc. IECD, 5.

HS: CA ḥidāru, with r-ext. as in IE, “white (camels, oxen)” = Egyp. ḥḍ “white (goose, oxen); ḥḍ-t “dawn, daybreak”; ḥḍī “light-giver”.

For Lith. jedra, CA ḡadri “smallpox”.

**3.7.41** Proto-IE-HS stem [ḥeḍ-] “be vexed”

IE: Lith. aidinti “to tease”, Br. oaz “passion”, aezen “vapor”.

HS: CA ḥadḍa “to incite”, Egyp. ḥḍnw “be vexed, angry”.

**3.7.42** Proto-IE-HS stem [ya(n)d-] “be dark; darkness”, with an infix \*-n- in IE and Egyp., but not in Sem. for seq. const.

IE: Vedic andha- “darkness”, Skt. andha-, Av. anda id., Lat. umbra “shade”.

HS: Egyp. ʾndw “darkness”, CA yaḍā “be dark”; yaḍīn “dark”; yaḍīyatu fem., “darkness”; ʾayḍā, yaḍā “to close the eyes”.

**3.7.43** Proto-IE-HS stem [ʾid-] “tree”

IE: Lat. silva- “forest”, fr. \*sidva-: Grk idō “forest, timber”. SS: §1.41.

HS: Akk. iṣu “wood, tree” (AG: 80), Ug. ʾš “tree” (UG, 535), Phoen. ʾš “wood” (PG, 134), CA ʾida-tu fem. “wood, tree”.

### 3.7.44 Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼudw-] “limb”

IE: OCS. udû “limb”, Pol. udo “limb, thigh”, Arm. z-awd “joint, seam”, Lith. audai “warp”.

HS: CA ʼudwu “member, limb”, Egyp. ʼḏi “member”.

### 3.7.45 Proto-IE-HS word [ʼurđ- ~ ʼard-] “side, half”: see §3.7.54 below

IE: Skt. ardha- “side” also “half, region”, Av. arəðō “side, half”, Oss. ärdäg id.: PIE \*ordho-. IECD, 878

HS: CA ʼurđu “side” also “half”; ʼāridā, dual, “side”; ʼirđu “region, valley”, Egyp. ʼnd “side”, Sab. ʼrđ “breadth” (SD, 19): cf. CA ʼarđu “width, breadth”.

### 3.7.46 Proto-IE-HS stem [radīy-] “be content, pleased, satisfied”; [ruđw-, riđa-] “content”

IE: OCS. radostī, Bulg., Cz. radost “joy”: OCS. radû “joyful, glad”, Lith. rōds “willing”.

HS: CA rādī “satisfied, content” also “willing”, Heb. ršy “be pleased with, favorable to” (Ryder, 1974:102) Arm. reʼa “be willing”, Soq. riđi “be happy, content”.

### 3.7.47 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḏar-] “edge”

IE: Skt. dhārā- “edge”, Av. dārā- id.

HS: CA ḏarīru “edge”, Egyp. ḏr “boundary, limit”. Ug. ḏr “top” (UG, 536) is cognate with CA ʼa-ḏirra-tu fem. pl.

### 3.7.48 Proto-IE-HS stem [rād-] “to run”

IE: OE. rīdan “to ride” ON rīða, OHG. rītan id., OIr. riadaim “to ride”, W. gorwydd “horse”, Gaul. para-werēdus “spare horse”.

HS: CA rāda “to train a horse on running”; mu-rawwiđu “horse-trainer”; riyāda-tu fem. “sport”, orig. “running”, Ug. rwd “to run” (UG, 535), Aram. rwš id., Heb. rūš id. Egyp. rwd “to march” is a doubtful cognate; most likely = CA rwd “to lead, send, drive, etc.”.

### 3.7.49 Proto-IE-HS proot [ḏau-] “sound”

IE: Skt. dhvanati “to sound”, OE. dynian “to resound”; dyne “noise”.

HS: CA ḏawḏā “noise, tumult”; ḏaudai- (rarely used) “to sound” ~ ḏaʼḏaʼ “noises of people” (§2.21.3.4 above).

### 3.7.50 Proto-IE-HS word [ʼęḏr- or ḏęrʼ-] “big/great udder”, a cpd of [ʼaʼ] “great, big” (§2.14. above) and [ḏęr-] “udder”. No matter whether /ʼaʼ/ is in initial or final position.

IE: Skt. ūdhar- “udder”, Lat. ūber id., OE. ūder, OIr. uth id.: PIE \*udhr/n-. WP. I, 111; SS: §4.42.

HS: a sequence /ʼḏr /or /ʼḏn/ does not exist in CA (ML, IV, 348) or in Sem. HS has three traditional candidate roots:

(i) the root in CA ḥudnu “breast”, Heb. ḥošen, Eth. ḥḏn id., etc.

(ii) the root in CA *ḍarʿu*, pl. *ḍurūʿu*, “udder”, Syr. *ṣorʿo* “breast (of woman)”, etc.

(iii) the root in Heb. *ʿṭn* “udder”, Som. *ʿando* (by metathesis) *id.*, etc.

The first candidate does not exactly mean “breast”. Its real meaning in CA is the two upper arms plus the chest, as a mother holding her baby or in hugging”. The second candidate = CA *ʿṭn* “hide”.

We are left with the true and simple cognate, namely CA *ḍarra-tu* fem. “udder”.

### 3.7.51 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḍau-] “to die”

IE: Goth. *ga-daupnan* “to die”, ON. *deyja* “to die”, Sw. *dö id.*, OE. *dēad* “death”, Ir. *dith* “death, end”, Skt. *dhvan-* “be distinguished”, Grk *θάνατος* “death”: PIE *\*dheu-*. SS: §4.75.

HS: Egyp. caus. *s-ḏy* “to die”, CA *ḍawā* n. or vb “waste away of the body by birth associated with weakness of bone”.

### 3.7.52 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḍab-] “to harm, injure”, related to [ḍab-] in §3.6.1 above.

IE: Skt. *dabhnōti* “hurts, injures”, Lat. *damnum* (fr. *dab-no*) “harm, injury”.

HS: CA *ḍabana* “to strike s.o. with a sword or stone and break his hand, leg, or gouge his eye”. §See 3.7.1 above.

### 3.7.53 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḍar-] “to work”

IE: Grk *drāō* “to do”, Lith. *daryti* “to do, make”, Latv. *darīt id.*

HS: Egyp. *ḍry* “to work”, CA *ḍariya* “be/become accustomed to, used to (any skill)”; *ḍarāwa-tu* “habit, practice”.

### 3.7.54 Proto-IE-HS [ʾrḍ-] “to prosper”: §3.7.45 above.

IE: Av. *arəḍ-* “to grow”, Skt. *ṛdhyāmi* “to thrive”; *ardhukah* “prospering”, Toch. A *orto* “upward”, Arm. *ard* “form, fashion, way”, Hitt. *artuwa* pl. descendant”. IECD, 885.

Egyp. *ʾnd* “be in good condition, be well”; *ʾndí* “one who is well, prosperous”, CA *ma-ʾraḍu* “fertile pasture land”, *ʾirḍu* “a term covering *trees growing in ʾarūdāwāt*, a pl. n. = *fertile place*, *ʾarḍu* “whatever one possesses on this earth (of wealth) or strives to possess”, *ʾirḍu* “ancestors”; *ʾarūḍu* “way, road”; *ʾarḍu* “show: as in *show-room*”.

### 3.7.54 PIE /dʰh/ = PHS /ḍ/, the emphatic counterpart of /ḍ/

#### 3.7.54.1 Proto-IE-HS word [vb *ḡāḍ-*, n. *ḡaiḍ*] “anger, rage”

IE: ON. *æði* “rage, fury”, OHG *wuot(i)*; adj. ON. *ōðer* “furious, mad”, OE *wōd* “mad, raving”, Goth. *wōds* “raging”, wrongly connected with Skt. *api-wat* “understand”, Lat. *vātes* “seer”, etc. SS: §16.43; WP I, 216.

HS: CA *ḡaiḍu* “anger, rage”; *ḡāḍa* “to anger, enrage”: comp. with *ḡadabu* “anger, rage”.

#### 3.7.54.2 Proto-IE-HS word [ḍul-] “concealment”

IE: Latv. *duls* “dark, dun”, ON. *dol* “concealment”, OE. *dol* “silly”, with various exts: Lat. *fulvus* “dusky”, Ir. *doilbh id.*, Lith. *dulsvas* “murky”. IECD, 218f.



HS: CA *ḏulla*-tu fem. “cloud”, CA *ḏallala* “to cover, shade”, Akk. *ṣalalu*, Aram. *ṭallēl* “to shade, roof”, Heb. *šālal*, Eth. *ṣalala* id. (Stehle, JAOS 60, 517), with m-ext.: CA *ḏulma*-tu fem. “darkness” (masc. *ḏalāmu*, Akk. *ṣalumu* id.).

The following are related words:

3.7.54.2a Hes. *θύλλα* “foliage, branches” = CA *ḏalīla*-tu fem. “garden or meadow crowded with trees”.

3.7.54.2b MHG. *tole* “ditch, drain”, Sw. *tolla* “trough” = CA *ḏalīla*-tu “pit, small marsh”.

**3.7.54.3** Proto-IE-HS word [*ḥuḏ-*] “spear, arrow”

IE: Skt. *iṣu-* “arrow”, Av. *iṣu-*, Grk *ἰός* “arrow”.

HS: Egyp. *ḥḏ-t* “spear”, Akk. *uṣṣu* “arrow”, Ug. *ḥḏ* id.

**3.7.54.4** Proto-IE-HS word [*ḏa'-*] “son/brother-in-law”

IE: W. *daw* “son-in-law”, OCor. *dof* id., Br. *deun*, MBr. *deuff* id., Ir. *damh* “tribe, family”, Grk *dāmos* “common people”. HG: §9; SS: §2.63.

HS: CA with /-m/ or /-b/ exts, *ḏa'mu* ~ *ḏa'bu* “brother-in-law”, Egyp. *ḏ'm* “young man”. See §3.7.26 above.

**3.7.54.5** Proto-IE-HS [*ḏer-*, *ḏer-*] “back”

IE: Lat. *dorsum* “back”.

HS: Egyp. *ḏrw* “belonging to the back or rump”.

**3.7.54.6** Proto-IE-HS word [*qarḏ-*] “praise”

IE: Goth. *hrōpeigs* “famous”, OE. *hrēp* “fame”, OHG. *hruom* id., ON. *hrōðr* “praise”: *hrosa* “to praise”.

HS: CA *ḡarraḏa* “to praise”; *ḡarīḏu*, *ḡarḏu* “praise”.

**3.7.54.7** Proto-IE-HS word [*ḥaḏ-*] “good fortune, luck”

IE: OIr. *ād* “good fortune”, NIr. *ādh* id.

HS: Ug. *ḥḏ* “luck, lucky” (UG: 534), CA *ḥaḏḏu* “luck, good fortune”.

**3.7.54.8** Proto-IE-HS stem [*maḏ-*] “tree, wood”

IE: OPruss. *median* “wood”, Lith. *medis* “tree, wood”, Latv. *mežs*, pl., “wood”.

HS: Egyp. *md* “stick” also “to saw wood, work in wood”, CA *maḏḏu* “wild pomegranate tree”.

**3.7.54.9** Proto-IE-HS [*maḏ-*] “honey”, the same as [*maḏ-*] above.

IE: OPruss. *meddo* “honey”, Lith. *medus*, OCS *medŭ* id., Skt. *medhu-* “honey” also “any sweet intoxicating drink”, Av. *maḏu-* “a kind of wine”, OE. *medu*, OHG. *metu* “mead”. PIE \**medhu-*. SS: §§5.84, 5.91; Meillet, *Introd.* 267; SOE: §227.

HS: CA *maḏḏu* lit. “pomegranate blossom so rich of honey that bees which feed on and give the best quality of honey”. CA *muzzu* “sweet wine”, i.e. *taste sweet* is a variant

form. Other variants are māḍī “white honey” also “wine” and maḍhu “honey from pomegranate blossom”.

### 3.7.55 *Comments on Exceptions*

We still have few cases where HS /ḍ/ = IE /d/, as in CA ḍarra-tu fem. “second wife” = Skt. dara- id. and a few others where IE /dh/ = HS /d/. An interesting phenomenon is noted in the 2<sup>nd</sup> type of correspondence. HS languages, namely CA, sometimes present two variant cognates, one with /ḍ/ and another with /d/. In addition, one should keep in mind the sequential constraint placed on the occurrence of /ḍ/ in certain combinations. For example, it can never be preceded by /s-/, /š-/, /θ-/, /t-/, etc. If a word originally includes any of such consonants, /-ḍ/ would naturally undergo change. Finally, we have already pointed out the common interchange of /ḍ/ and /ṣ/. This type of change is not problematic since CA has preserved both words one with /ḍ/ and the other with /ṣ/. For example, Skt. sidh- “to repel, drive off” = CA ṣadda “to stave off”, fr. ḍidd “against”: comp. ṣadda-hu = ḍadda-hu (-hu = him) “turns one away from”. The expected appearance of vowel /-i-/ in the Skt. word strengthens my view that IE verbs often retain the root vowel of the word from which they are derived.

**3.7.55.1** Proto-IE-HS word [darg-] “to run” also [ḍarg-] “to run” as in CA ḍurriḡa, pass., “cause to run, to flow”; ḍariḡu “very fast, rapid”.

IE: Skt. dhraj- “to move, glide; course”, Grk trékhō “to run”, trokhós “course, race”, Ir. droch “wheel”, Arm. durgan id., ON dorg “trailing-line”. IECD, 203; WP. I, 874.

HS: CA daraḡa “to move, step”; darūḡu “fast, quick”; ma-draḡu “runway”, Syr. dargā “step”, Heb. darak “to walk”, Ga. dorgoma “to compete in running, to run”, Som. durug “to move”, Kab. derga “to walk, progress”.

**3.7.55.2** Proto-IE-HS stem [daw-(r-)] or [dā-(r-)] “wall; house”. *Is it related to* Egyp. ḏ’i “wall” > ḏry “wall, fort, domicile”?

IE: Skt. dvār “door”, Av. dvar- id., Goth. daur, OE. duru id., OIr. dorus, W. drws id., Toch. twere, Alb. derë id., OCS. dvîrŭ, Oss. dwar id.: PIE \*dhwer-. IECD, 226; SOE: §220; WP. I, 869.

HS: Akk. dāru “wall”, CA dāru [dwr] “house”, Ga. dari “boundary, limit”. See §3.6.4 above.

**3.7.55.3** Proto-IE-HS stem [duh-] “smoke”, ult. fr. [dū- ~ duw-] in CA dāha “be giddy, dizzy”.

IE: Hitt. tuhhus “smoke”, Skt. dhūmas id., Lat. fūmus id., Lith. dūmas id.: PIE \*dhumo-, assumed to be a deriv. of \*dhū- “to shake, agitate”. IHL: §36j; IECD, 219f; Buck, §1.83; WP. I. 835.

HS: CA duhduha “be dizzy”; dahdaḡa “make giddy; vertigo”; dahahu “blackness”; duhhu (poet.) “smoke”, duhānu is the most common word for “smoke”, Heb. \*ḏlḡn \* “smoke”, preserved in מִלֶּחֶם “a species of millet... of a dark smoky color” (OT, 220), perh. Egyp. thth “be disarranged, topsy-turvy, confused”.

**3.7.55.4** Proto-IE-HS word [gady-] “to steal”

IE: Skt. gadhya- “be seized”, Ir. gataim “to steal”, Lith. godus “avaricious, stingy”.

HS: CA ḡadaya, ḡadā, or CX. ista-ḡdā “to beg”; ḡādī “begger”, Ga. gadu “robber, enemy”.

**3.7.55.5** Proto-IE-HS word [mady-] “middle”

IE: Skt. madhyas “middle”, Lat. medius id., Grk mēsos id., Goth. midjis id., OE. midd id., Ir. mid- (as in mid-nogt “mid-night”). SOE: §227; SS: 12.37; Meillet, Introd.: 80.

HS: CA madya-tu “middle”, Heb. madah id., Egyp. met’ id.

**3.7.55.6** Proto-IE-HS stem [rad-] “to grow”.

IE: Skt. rudh- “to grow”, Av. rud- id.

HS: Egyp. rd “to grow”, Assy. radū “to add” (King, 1898: 384), CA radā “to increase”, Soq. rdy id.

**3.7.55.7** Proto-IE-HS word [rud’-] “blood, red”

IE: OE. rēad “red”, ON. roðra “sacrificial blood”, Skt. rudhira- “blood”.

HS: CA ruda’u pl. “blood, blood from a wound”, preserved in a number of old proverbs (LA). The stem [rud-] is also seen with different exts as in *rādinīy* “very red”; ’ardanu “red tissue of silk and wool”, etc.

**3.7.55.8** Proto-IE-HS stem [sad-] “guide aright”

IE: Skt. sādhu- “good”, orig. “right, straight”: sādhu- “to accomplish, guide aright, reach one’s goal”, Gr. éthos “character, custom”, Goth. sidus “morality, manner”, OE. sidu id. SS: §16.71, IECD, 1117f

HS: Egyp. st “to guide, lead”, CA sadā “right, rectitude, aim, goal”; saddada “to succeed, accomplish, guide aright, teach, lead to the right way, etc.”.

**3.7.55.9** Proto-IE-HS word [wada-] “to deliver”

IE: Lith. vedu “to marry” also “to lead”, Hitt. wedāmi “to carry, bring”, Skt. vādhā- “bride” also “to lead”. Meillet, Introd. 349; IECD, 1497; WP. I, 254; SS: §4.62.

HS: CA wadana “to help a bride dress before leading her to the wedding”: wadda, “to deliver, carry”, Egyp. wdw “leader”, Som. wad “to drive”.

**3.7.55.10** Proto-IE-HS word [wad’-] “to slay, kill”

IE: Skt. vadh- “to strike, slay”, Toch. B wet- “to fight”: PIE \*wedh-. IECD, 1498.

HS: Egyp. wd’ “to thrust” also “to push”, CA ’a-wdā “to kill”; wada’u ~ wadā “death”, Ga. wadu “to deter”. One can substitute /r-/ for /w-/ as in CA ’a-rdā “make fall to the ground, i.e. kill”.

**3.7.55.11** Proto-IE-HS stem [yad-] “to fight, be powerful”

IE: Skt. yudh- “to fight”, Av. yuz-, OPers. yud- “be in commotion”, Lith. judinti “to move”, OCS. ojîminû “fighting man”, Lat. iubēre “to command”. IEV, 49.

HS: Egyp. yd “to rage at; rath”, ydw “to run”, CA yadu “power, might” as in the Koran (ءامسللو فرعاهاذ دياأب...), ’ayyada “to strengthen, support”, Heb. yād “power”, Syr. īdā id. (OT, 377), Ga. yadu “anxious”.

### 3.8 *PROTO-IE-HS* /p/

Proto-IE-HS /p/ is a voiceless bilabial stop. It is in PIE /p/ and in PHS /p/.

#### 3.8.1 Proto-IE-HS stem [pad-] “foot”

IE: Skt. pad- “foot”; padam “footstep”, Av. pad-, OPers. pāda, Oss. fād “foot”, Grk. gen. sg., podós, Aeol. peda id., Lat. pēs, gen. pl., pedum id., Goth. fōtus, ON. fōter, OE., OS. fōt “foot”, Lith. pēda “sole, foot measure”, Hitt. gen. pl. patan “foot”, Lyc. pede, Hier. Hitt. dat. sg. pati id.: PIE \*ped-, \*pēd-. IECD, 909f; SS: §4.37; WP. II, 23; IEV, 107; Meillet, Introd. 275; IER, 47; SOE: §221.

HS: Egyp. pd “foot”: CA fadda “to stamp with the feet, tread on heavily”, fadfada-tu fem. “echo or sound of footsteps”, prob. Shil. afud “knee” (Applegate, 1958: 46): see §2.3.44, 2.14.13, and 2.17.38 above.

Some related words are:

3.8.1a IE: Skt. pad- “to go” also “to fall”, Av. pad- “to go downward”, Grk. pēdāō, Dor. pād- “to leap”, OCS. padati “to fall”, Cz. padit “to rush”, ON. feta “to step”, OE. fetian “to fetch”: SS: §10.23; IECD, 899; WP. II, 23.

HS: Egyp. pd “to run away, hasten”; pdpd, by redupl., “to take to flight”, CA fadda “to run away out of fear” also “to flap the wings fast for rapid flying (of bird)”; fadfada, by redupl., “to injure the feet from treading so heavily on the ground or from running” (LA), perh. Ug. pdd “be worn out” (UG. 537).

3.8.1b IE: Skt. padvam “road, earth”, Grk. pédon “ground, soil”; pedíon “plain”; pedinós “flat country”, Hitt. pi-e-da-an “place”, Umbr. peršum “ground”, OCS. podŭ “ground”: SS: §1.212; IECD, 912; HCG: §85; SOE: §222.

HS: Akk. padānu “way, road”, Mand. padana id. (MD, 359), Egyp. pdst, pl., “tract of land”, CA fadfadu, by redupl., “flat land”; faddā-nu “farmland”; faddādu “farmer”, with n-ext., CA faddānu “acre of land, farm”, Sab. fṭn (\*fdn) “to assign land to someone” (SD, 47), Heb. pdn, Syr. pdn “plain, low region” (OT, 835). See §2.12.31 above.

3.8.1c Hitt. peda “to bring” = CA ’afida “to come, approach”. For the semantic relationship between ‘come’ and ‘bring’: CA ’a- ḥḍara “to bring” is the caus. form of ḥḍara “to come”.

#### 3.8.2 Proto-IE-HS stem [pak-] “to strike, destroy”

IE: Av. pašš- “to stab”, Toch. B pyak “to hit”, Alb. pēr-pjek, aor. -poqa “to dash, strike”: PIE \*pek-, \*pekō-. IECD, 913; WP II, 17.

HS: Egyp. pk “to destroy”, Akk. pakû “to pierce, press” (AG, 93), CA fakka “to tear down, take apart”, Mand. pkk “to destroy, break” (MD, 373), Shil. fuku “to separate” (Applegate, 1958: 52).

**3.8.3** Proto-IE-HS stem [paq-] “to pluck, pull off”. Grm. has preserved a reflex of /k̥/.

IE: Grk pékō “to shear”, Lat. pectō id., Lith. pešti “to pluck, pull”: OE. feohtan, OHG. fehtanto “fight”: SS: §20.11; WP. II, 16f; EM, 745, IEV, 273; IER, 48; DRLE, 148f.

HS: Eyp. f̥ky “to pluck, pull off”, CA faḫa’a “to pull off, break”, Mand. p̥ka, Aram., Heb. p̥k’ (also CA faḫa’a) “to break asunder, break open, split” (MD, 376), Bil., Ag. faḫ “to pierce”.

**3.8.4** Proto-IE-HS stem [paq-] “to see, look”, fr. an earlier [Waq- or qaW-]. In some IE languages caus. /ša/ was added to the already compound word. The proot is seen in Skt. (with unexpected /-k-/ for /-ć-/ ) ĩkṣ- “to see”; akṣi- “eye”, Lith. akis “eye”, OCS. oko, Lat. oculus, etc. id. = CA \*’aḫ id., etc. see §2.10.14 above.

IE: Skt. paçyati “sees”, Lat. specere “to see, look at”, Grk sképtomai, by metathesis, “to look carefully”, OHG. spehōn “to look at carefully” : PIE \*spek̥-, \*(s-)pek̥-. SS: §15.51; IECD, 1253; WP. II, 659f; Meillet, Introd.140; IEV, 283; EM, 960f; IER, 63.

HS: Eyp. s-ḫb, by metathesis, as in Grk above, and voicing of \*p in final position because of seq. const., “to see, look at”, CA faḫiha “to perceive, understand”, with interchange between /h/ and /ḫ/: faḫaḫa “to perceive, gain insights into” also “to open the eyes (puppy)”, OAram. p̥ḫḫ “open-eyed”, overseer, spy, supervisor”; hp̥ḫḫ “inspector” (NWSI II, 933-934), Heb. p̥ḫḫ “to open the eyes; to have the eyes open, be wide awake”; peḫaḫ “open-eyed” (OT, 863). See §2.2.45, n 1 & 2 above.

**3.8.5** Proto-IE-HS word for “to cook, bake, roast, boil”

IE: Grk péssō “to cook, bake”, Skt. pac- “to cook, bake, roast, boil”, Toch. pāk- “to cook”, Lith. kept, by metathesis, “to bake”, Latv. cept, also by metathesis, “to bake, roast”, OCS. and common Slav. pešti “to bake”, OE. bacan id., Lat. coquere “to cook, boil”, Hitt. sam-pukki “gruel”: PIE \*pek̥W-, \*pequō. IECD, 920f; SS: §§5.21-5.24; WP. II, 17f; IEV, 273.

HS: Eyp. has a number of forms that go back to one single word. Such forms display the same types of sound changes noted in IE words above:

a) ḫpn by metathesis as in the Bal. languages above, “to bake”.

b) pss, as in Grk péssō above, (fr. \*pek̥s, where \*ḫ > s by *regressive assimilation*) “to cook, boil, roast” ~ fss “to cook, boil, bake”.

A possible CA cognate may be fāḫu “a dish full of food” also “cooked oil”, occurred *once* in poetry:

«... miḫlu ’al-’asāwida ḫad mussiḫna bil-fāḫi»<sup>302</sup>.

Eyp. pss ~ fss above is closely related to f̥ḫ’-t “to feed; food”. This would make the word a cpd of \*pā- and [ḫau- or ḫū-] “food; eat” (§2.9.27 above).

In conclusion, all words cited above are derivatives of a cpd of [pā-] and [ḫau-]. For proot [pā or pa’] “cook”, see §2.2.47, esp. n. 7b above. The original meaning of the cpd is “cook food”.

<sup>302</sup> CA also has ḫafyatu “food”; ḫafāwatu “healthy or good nourishment”; ḫafiy “guest, so-called because is treated kindly and served with food”; ḫafiyatu “food given to guest”. This has nothing to do with the word under study, and its [ḫa-] is a proot (§2.17.83 above).

### 3.8.6 Proto-IE-HS word [pilq-] “ax”

IE: Skt. paraću- “ax”, Grk pélekus id., said to be an IE loanword fr. Akk. IECD, 915.

HS: Akk. pilakku “ax” (Gelb, 1952: 177), CA falaḫa “to split, cleave”.

### 3.8.7 Proto-IE-HS word [palg-] “be crooked”.

IE: OE. felg “rim of a wheel”, OHG. felga id., fr. notion of “crooked, bent”, according to SS: §8.28.

HS: CA falîḡu “be crooked (feet, etc.)”; ’a-flaḡu, mu-fliḡu, adjs., “crooked”; falaḡu “paralysis”, Mand. palag, Syr. plg “paralysis” (MD, 361).

### 3.8.8 Proto-IE-HS word [palg/-k] “field” with [palg/-k] “stream, canal”, related to [pilg-] “side, half” in §3.7.9 below.

IE: Grk pélikē “basin”, Lith. pelkē “marsh”, Latv. pelce id.

HS Akk. palgu “canal”, Heb. peleg “brook, rivulet”, CA fuluḡu “river, stream”, Eth. falag “river, large stream” (OT, 846), Sab. flg “water channel” (SD, 44). Also, CA falaku “waves” also “ship”, Sab. flk “ship”.

### 3.8.9 Proto-IE-HS word [pilg-] “side, half”, related to \*palg “field”.

IE: Grk plágia pl. “side”, Dor. plágos id., LLat. plaga “area, region”, ON. flaki “wicker shield”. IECD, 942f.

HS: CA filḡu “half” with fālūḡa-tu “field”, OAram. plg “half” (AG, 13), OffAram., JAram., Palm. plg, EHeb. peleg “half” (NWSI II, 912-914), Mand. palag, Syr. plg “half, share, portion” (MD, 360). For the semantic relationship between “side” and “half”: cf. Skt. ardha- and CA ’arḡu both mean “side” and “half”; Lith. pusē “half” and Toch. A poṣi “side”; etc.

### 3.8.10 Proto-IE-HS word [palθ-] “to plunder”

IE: Lith. plėšti “to plunder, snatch”, Latv. plēst id., ON. fletta “excoriate, strip”, etc. IECD, 951.

HS: Akk. palāšu “to burglarize” (AG, 93), CA CVIII ’iftalata, (fr. \*’iftalaḡa, r. \*flθ rather than *flt*, since Sem. \*θ is regularly Akk. š, CA θ), “to steal, rob, snatch”.

### 3.8.11 Proto-IE-HS stem [pil-] “hair”

IE: Lat. pilus “hair”, pilleus “felt”, Grk pîlos “hair, felt”, Oss. pirîn “to comb out”. IECD, 1650; SS: §4.14.

HS: CA falîlu “hair”, in Huḡaiyil falîla-tu “palm fibers”, Ga. fila “comb”, Som. fila id.; Har. fila, Z. filä, Dar., Sa. fila id., etc. see §2.1.10, n. 4 above.

### 3.8.12 Proto-IE-HS word [pilṭaḡ-] “broad, flat, open”

IE: Skt. pṛthus- “wide, broad”: prath- “to extend”, Grk platús “broad”, Lith. platus id., Hitt. palhis “wide”: PIE \**pl-et-X-*: SL, 70-71, 291; \**plaxnos-*: IEL.: §37ℓ, etc., fr. an ext. of \**pel-*, \**plə-*, etc. To this IE. word also belong (with numerous exts) Grk fláx “flat surface”, plastikós “broad”, Lat. plānus “flat”, OCS. ploskû “flat”, Russ. polyj “open,

uncovered”, Lith. *plonas* “thin”, Latv. *plaju* “flatten, spread out”, etc. SS: §12.61; IECD, 948ff; IEV, 203; HCG: §85; WP. II, 99f; IER, 51; SOE: 150.

HS: CA *fiḷāḥu* ~ *fiṛṭāḥu*, mu-*faḷṭaḥu* “broad, wide, large”: *faḷṭaḥa* ~ *faṛṭaḥa* “to flatten, extend, stretch”. The notion “expand, extend” is related to the idea “prosper, gain, etc.” as expressed by [palḥ-] in §3.8.13 below.

IE-HS words below may or may not related:

3.8.12a IE: OCS. *platû* “cloth”, Pol. *plat* “piece of cloth, rag”, OCS. *plaští* “cloak”, Bulg. *plašt* id., OPruss. *ploaste* “sheet”, etc.: Lith. *platus* “broad”, etc. above. ‘*Cloth*’ is originally ‘*something spread out*’: SS: §6.21.

HS: Ug. *pld* “a kind of garment” (UG, 533), CA *falūtu* id., Egyp. *pl* “strip of linen cloth”.

**3.8.13** Proto-IE-HS word [palaḥ-] “to prosper, trade”, developed from “expand, extend”; through “*grow in size*” and then “*grow in wealth*”.

IE: Grk *polēō* “to sell”, Skt. *pañ-* “to bargain, buy, bet”; *pañas* “gain”, Lith. *pelnas* “profit”, OHG. *fāli* “for sale”: PIE \**pel-*. SS: §11.82; WP. II, 51; IER, 48.

HS: CA *falaḥa* “to persuade one to buy and sell, to appoint one to buy or sell” also “to gain, attain”; *faḷāḥu* “growth, gain, success”; CIV *ʾaflaḥa* “to succeed, prosper”; *faḷḥu* “bidder, out bidder”, Sab. *flḥ* “be successful” (SD, 44), Hatra, Palm. *plḥ* “workman” (NWSI II, 914), OAram. *plḥ* “to serve” (AG, 13), Shil. *flḥ* “to grow, succeed” (Applegate, 1958: 52).

**3.8.14** Proto-IE-HS stem [pal-] “to cleave, rend, tear”

IE: Lith. *plēšti* “to tear”, Latv. *plēst* id., ON. *flā* “to flay”, Dan. *flaa* id.: OE: *flēan* id.

HS: CA *falla* “to break, tear”, Ge. *fālfālā* “to burst, break out”, Har. *filāfāla* “to detach” (HED, 62). The same broad idea can also be expressed by suffixing any third radical to \**pal-*, including laryngeals /ʾ, ḥ, ʿ/, hence *falaʾa*, *falaḥa*, *falaya*.

**3.8.15** Proto-IE-HS word [pils-] “stone”

IE: Grk *pélla* “stone”, OHG. *pelis* id., ON. *fjalla* “rock, mountain”, OIr. *all* “rock”: PIE \**pel-*, \**pelis-*. IECD, 1649; SS: §1.50; CCG: §26.7; IER, 49.

HS: Egyp. *prḏʾn* “a kind of stone”, CA *fil(i)zu* “stone”, Soq. *fels* “rock”, PChad. \**pr-* “stone”, OAram. *psl* (by metathesis) “hewn stone” (AG, 13), OffAram. *pslh*, Pun. *psl-t* (NWSI II, 923), Phoen. *psl* “to hew” (PG, 138), Ug. *psl* “craftsman” (UG, 532).

**3.8.16** Proto-IE-HS word [pul(w)-] “foal”

IE: Grk *pōlos* “foal”, Lat. *pullus* id., Goth. and common Grm. *fula* “foal”, Alb. *peḷë* “mare”. WP. II, 75f; IECD, 973; SS: §3.45.

HS: CA *fulwu* “foal, weaned young animal”: *faḷā* “to wean (only young of animal)”, Soq. *folḥi* “young of animal”, prob. Shil. *afulus* “chicken” (Applegate, 1958: 46).

#### Comments



There is still one interesting notion expressed by CA *falā*: “to weigh mentally, look at pensively, reflect upon a thing to anticipate consequences”, which is related to both *falā* “wean”, i.e. *prevent a young of animal from sucking its mother’s milk*; in other words preventing it from ‘touching’ its mother’s breast, and *ta-fāla* “to touch closely one another (often animals)”. If we combine these ideas into a general semantic heading, we will get something close to ‘*perceive by touching*’, ‘*feel of*’ as expressed by OE. *fēlan*, OHG. *fuolen*, and by Lat. *palpāre* orig. “to stroke”, i.e. ‘touch’, later “to feel” = OffAram. pl’ “to scrutinize, scan”, Akk. *palû* “to search” (NWSI II, 911). The Akk. form = CA *falla* “to search, usu. by touching, as for lice”, hence also “scrutinize, examine closely”, Heb. *pll* “to judge” (1 Sam 2.25) also “think, suppose” (Gen. 48.11). OT, 848.

### 3.8.17 Proto-IE-HS stem [pan-] “cloth, garment”

IE: Lat. *panus* “piece of cloth”, OCS. *ponija* “garment”, Goth. *fana* “cloth”, OSax. *fano* id., OE. *fana* “banner”, Hitt. *panussa* “band”: PIE *\*pan-*, *\*pān-*, etc. SS: §6.21; IECD, 904; WP. II, 5; IER, 46f; EM, 729.

HS: Egyp. *pnpn* “a kind of stuff or garment”, CA *mu-fannanu* “a kind of garment”; *ta-fnīnu* “a garment made (or woven) differently: *thin in one place but thick in another, garment containing different threads*”: *ta-fannana* “make a combination of”: *fannu* “style”.

Here may also belong CA *’a-fnānu*, pl. of *fananu*, “plait of hair”; *fainānu*, adj., = Arm. *hanum* “to plait”, Dor. *pānē* “woof”, *pānion* “bobbin” (IECD, 905). Otherwise, IE words = the root in Egyp. *fehen* “twisted or plaited fibre-work”. See §3.8.18 below.

### 3.8.18 Proto-IE-HS stem [pan-] “to swell”

IE: Lat. *panus* (above) also denotes “tumor”, LLat. *pana* “swollen gland”, Bulg. *pon-ka*, dim., “nipple”. IECD, 904f.

HS: CA *faninu* “swelling of the armpit”: *fanana* “to swell (armpit)”, but with no deriv. signifying “armpit”, Ga. *finno* “smallpox”, Som. *fin* “pimple” (Zaborski, 1975: 324), perh. Egyp. *pens-t* “bolus, pill”.

### 3.8.19 Proto-IE-HS stem [pan-] “swampy land”

IE: OPers. *pannean* (*\*panjan*) “marsh”, Goth. *fani* “mud”, OE. *fenn*, ON. *fen* “fen”, OCS. *po-ponû* “seaweed”. IECD, 904.

HS: Sab. *m-fnt*, r. *fnw/y*, “land irrigated by canals”, CA *’āfānī* pl. “kind of wet or fresh plant”; *fanā* “kind of herb (a finger or less tall)”.

### 3.8.20 Proto-IE-HS stem [par-] “be before, in front” > [pir’-] “first”, which is a cpd of a stem [paur] “first” + [’aW] “one”.

IE: Lat. *prīmus* “first”, Grk *prāmos* “leader, first ranker”, Lith. *pirmas* “first”, OCS. *prûvû* id., Goth. *fruma*, OE. *first*, OHG. *furisto*, OS. *furist* id.

All are derivatives of PIE *\*per*, etc. “before, in front” in Hitt. *parā* “forth, before”, *pirān* “before, in front”, Skt. *pūrvas* “preceding, former”; *paras* “forward, in front”; *pra*, adv., “before” Av. *frā*, Lat., Grk *prō*, Goth. *fra* id., Alb. *para* id., Toch. B *parwe*

“before”: IECD, 987ff; SS: §13.34; WP. II, 33, 35, 37; Meillet, Introd.: 370; HCG: §58; IER, 49; IEV, 209; DRLE, 154ff.

HS: Ug. pr’ “first” (UG, 532), Sab. fr’ “first-fruits, first decade of month” (SD, 45-46), CA far’u “first-born (of domestic animals) also “prince, head of a family” far’atu “best (i.e. ‘first’) lady”, Heb. pr’ “leader of an army or people” also as a verb “to lead on, go before” (OT, 868) = CA fara’a “to surpass others, to be highest”; fara’a “be before, rank first, precede”, Egyp. pr-’ “a high-handed man, hero” also pr’ “hero”, Egyp. pr, pr’ “go forth”.

Some derivatives of Proto-IE-HS stem [par-] are given below:

3.8.20a IE: Skt. pāra- “end”; para “extreme, opposite”, Av. pārō “edge, end, shore”, Grk péras “end”, Goth. fēra “side”. IECD, 926f.

HS: CA fāri’a-tu fem. “side (of a road), end”; far’u “edge (of a bow), top, summit”, Sab. fr’ “upper part, summit (of building)” (SD, 46), Egyp. pr’ “to expire” i.e. *end*.

3.8.20b IE: Goth. frumisti “beginning”, OE. fruma id.: Goth. fruma “first”, etc. above.

HS: CA CIV ’a-fra’a “to begin”; CX ’ista-fra’a id.; ’ifrā’u, ’istifrā’u “beginning”, Heb. pr’ “to begin” (OT, 868): Ug. pr’ “first”, etc. above.

3.8.20c IE: Skt. para- adj. “far, distant”, Goth. faira “far”. WP. II, 31ff; SS: §12.44; IECD, 926; SOE: 126.

HS: CA fāri’u “long, tall”; mu-fri’u id. “wide, broad” (Al ‘Ayn II, 126; LA), Sab. pr’ “lofty” (SD, 46). For the semantic relationship between “long” and “far”: cf. Lat. *longe* “far” is a derivative of *longus* “long”, ON. *langt* “far” is from *langr* “long”, etc. Accordingly, the original meaning of Skt. and Grm. words above seem to be “long/tall”.

### 3.8.21 Proto-IE-HS stem [par-] “to bear”

IE: Lat. parere “to bear”, Lith. perėti, pariù “to brood, hatch out”, Latv. perēt id.: PIE \*perə-, \*perō-. IECD, 926; SS: §4.27; WP. II, 41f; IER, 50; DRLE, 155.

HS: Akk. pir’u “offspring, descendant” (AG, 94), Egyp. pr id., Cush.: Bed. firi “to give birth”: CA farā “to make”, Heb. pārāh (rarely pārā’) “to bear, bring forth, *of men and beast*”, in Syr. “be fruitful; progeny”, in Eth. “to bear fruit” (OT: 865):

Some derivatives are:

3.8.21a IE: Grk pórtis “calf, young cow”, Skt. pṛthukah “young animal”, OE. fearr “calf”, etc. Meillet, Introd. 64, 353; IECD, 879; SL, 70; WP. II, 41; SS: §3.21; IER, 50.

HS: Akk. pūru “young bull” (AG, 95), Ug. pr “bull” (UG: 530) = CA furāru “young of sheep”, Hatra prh “ewe of sheep” (NWSI II, 936).

3.8.21b Egyp. prít, pl., “woman of the chamber” and Grk pornē “prostitute” may belong here.

### 3.8.22 Proto-IE-HS word [pars-] “to break, divide”

IE: Hitt. parš- “to break, crumble”, Lat. pars “share, part”.

HS: Akk. *parāsu* “to divide”, Heb. *paras*, CA *farasa* “to break, divide”, Shil. *fars* “to slash”, Phoen., OAram., OffAram. *prs* “portion” (NWSI II, 940-1).

### 3.8.23 Proto-IE-HS word [pard-] “to think”

IE: Goth. *fraþjan* “to think”, Latv. *prast* “to understand”, Lith., with nasal infix, *prantus* “intelligent”, Toch. A *pratim* “decision”, etc. SS: §17.16; WP. II, 86; IECD, 988.

HS: Akk. *paršu* “decree” (AG, 94), CA *farada* “to assume, suppose, speculate” also “to cut fast”, Phoen. *prš* “to break through” (PG: 139), Eth. *frd* “to judge” (HED, 64), Egyp. *prđ* “to separate”.

### 3.8.24 Proto-IE-HS word [parq-] “to break, split”

IE: Skt. *parcānah* “chasm”, Lith. *pra-perša* “chasm, breach”. IECD, 924.

HS: Ug. *prḳ* “to break” (UG, 531), OAram. *prḳ* “part, section, to cut off” (NWSI II, 943), CA *farraḳa* “to divide, separate, split”, Heb. *pereḳ* “to break or tear off, rend in pieces” (OT, 870), Shil. *fark* “to separate” (Applegate, 1958: 52), Hausa *fark* “to rend, tear”.

### 3.8.25 Proto-IE-HS stem [par-], with different exts, “wing, feather; to fly”

IE: Skt. *parṇam-* “wing, feather”, Av. *parəna-* id., Lat. *penna* (from *\*perna* by assim.) id., OCS, Russ. *pero* “feather”, etc. PIE *\*per-*. SS: §§3.92-3.93; IECD, 926; WP. II, 31.

HS: Berb. *fr* “wing” also “to fly”, PChad. *\*pr-* “to fly” (Carnochan, 1975: 463), Soq. *fer*, Meh *farr* id., Shh. *ferfir* “wing”, Cush.: Mafa *parr* “to fly”, Housa *fira* id., CA *farfara* “to shake the wings”; *furfūru* “a kind of bird”, Heb. *parpur* id. with *pirpēr* “to fly”, Tna-*färfär bälä* “palpitate” (HED, 64, HSED, n. 1981).

### 3.8.26 Proto-IE-HS stem [par-] “to jump, run swiftly”, related to *\*par-* “to fly” above

IE: Skt. *pru-* “to jump”, Russ. *prygat’* id. OHG. *frō* “swift”, ON. *frār* id. SS: §10.43; WP. II, 88.

HS: Egyp. *prpr* “to leap about, run swiftly”, PChad. *\*pr-* “to leap” (Carnochan, 1975: 463), Heb. *prṛ* “to run, be born swiftly” (OT, 870), Ug. *prṛ* “to flee” (UG: 532), CA *farra* id., *’afara* “to jump”, Shh. *ferr* id., Soq. *fer* “to run”, Cush.: Sa., Af. *fərr* “jump”.

### 3.8.27 Proto-IE-HS stem [par-], by redupl., “be rash, hasty”, fr. [par-] “to jump, etc.” above.

IE: Grk *pérperos* “rash, fickle, vain”, Lat. *perperus* id., Pers. *farfar* “hurry”. IECD, 927.

HS: CA *farfara* “to act foolishly with excessive haste”; *farfara-tu* fem. “recklessness, irresponsible or silly behavior”; *farfara* also means “to hurry, shake, stir, move”, Heb. *prṛ* “make vain, bring to naught, frustrate” (OT, 870), DAram. *pr* “foolishness, silliness” (NWSI II, 934), Amh. *tānfäräffärä* “to stir”, etc. (HED, 64)

### 3.8.28 Proto-IE-HS word [parq/-š-] “to ask, explain”, prob. the notion “ask” is derived from “explain”.

IE: Skt. *pracchati* “asks”, *pracch-*, *praç-*, Av. *fras-* “to ask”, OCS. *prosiyati*, Lith. *prašyti* id., Goth. *fraihnan* id., Toch. A *prak-*, B. *park-*, *prek-* id., Lat. *poscō* (\**porcscō*) id., *precārī* “to pray, beg”: PIE \**prek-*, \**pr(k)-sk-*. Meillet, *Introd.* 90, 348; WP. II, 44; IECD, 985; SS: §18.31; SL, 92; IEV, 275; EM, 794f.

HS: \**par-* with /-š/ or /-k/ ext.:

a) with š-ext.: Akk. *parāšu* “to explain”, Heb. *pāraš* id., BAram. *prš* in pass. “be explained, interpreted”, TAram. *prš* “be clear”.

b) with k-ext.: CA *faraḳa* “to make clear, clarify, explicate” also “appear, seem”, Heb. *prḳ* “to distinguish” (OT, 870), Sab. *frḳ* id. (SD, 15) “to solve (a problem).

### 3.8.29 Proto-IE-HS word [parq-] “to frighten, threaten; fear”

IE: OPers. *parsāmiy* “to punish”, OCS. *prêsto* “to threaten”, Goth. *fourhte* “fear, fright”; *faurhts* “fearful”, OE. *forht* “afraid, terrible”, OHG. *forhta* “fear”: PIE \**perk-*. IECD, 924; WP. II, 48f.

HS: CA *faraḳa* “to frighten”; *faraḳu* “fear, fright”; *faruḳu* “fearful, afraid”, Assy. *parāku* (\**parāḳu*) “to display force toward, bring upon with violence” (King, 1898: 377), Heb. *pereḳ* “violence, rapine” (OT, 870), Sab. *frḳ* “be dispersed, scatter, seek safety” (SD, 46): Har. *fāra* “fear, be afraid”; *fīrāra* “frighten, threaten”, Te. *fārha*, Amh., Arg. *fārra* id., S., W. *fare* id., etc. (HED, 63).

### 3.8.30 Proto-IE-HS word [parḥ-] “to march about”

IE: Hitt. *parah-* “drive, ride”, Grk *peráō* “to pass through”, Skt. *pr-* “to carry across, deliver”, Av. *par-* id., Lat. *portāre* “to carry”, Goth. and common Grm. *faran* “to go, travel”: PIE. \**perX-* (\**per-*). SS §10.47; IHL: §36g; WP. II, 39ff; IECD, 922; EM, 792, 794; IEV, 273.

HS: Egyp. *prḥ* “to march about”, Heb. *paraḥ* “to fly” (OT, 866), Syr. *paraḥ* id., CA *faraha* (from \**faraḥja*) “active, brisk”.

### 3.8.31 Proto-IE-HS word [pariḥ-] “be happy, glad”, related to [parḥ-] above.

IE: Skt. *pri-* “to please”, OHG. *frō* “happy, glad”. SS: §16.21; IER, 53.

HS: CA *fariḥja* “be happy, glad”; *ʾa-fraḥja* “to make happy, please”; *fariḥu* “happy, glad”, Heb. *prḥ* caus. “to flourish, blossom” (OT, 870), Meh. *frḥ* “happy”, Kab. *ferḥ* “joy”, Shil. *farḥ* “to enjoy, celebrate” (Applegate, 1958: 52),

### 3.8.32 Proto-IE-HS stem [pary-] “sin”

IE: Toch. A *pare*, B *peri* “sin, fault”, Av. *par-* “to condemn”, Arm. *her* “hate, envy”, Goth. *fairina* “crime, blame”, OHG. *firina* id., OE. *firen*, OFris. *firne* “crime”: PIE \**per-*. IECD, 923; SS: §16.76.

HS: Egyp. *pr-t* “sin”, CA *farā* “to slander, fabricate lies”; CIV *ʾafrā* “to blame”, Ga. *ferada* “to condemn”, DAram *pr* “foolishness, silliness” (NWSI II, 934).

### 3.8.33 Proto-IE-HS stem [pur-] “wheat”

IE: Grk *pūrós* “wheat”, Lith. *pūrai* id., OCS. *pyro* “spelt”, OE. *fyrz* “furze”, Skt. *pūra-* “unleavened oilcake”: PIE \**puro-(s)*. IECD, 1011; WP. II, 83; SS: §8.43; IER, 53.

HS: Egyp. per-t “wheat, grain”, Cop. fre id., CA furfūru “a kind of grain or barley”.

**3.8.34** Proto-IE-HS word [purd-] “gate, opening”: see §3.11.29, ft <sup>1</sup> of n. 5b above.

IE: Av. pərətu- “passage”, Lat. portus “harbor”, Grk poros “ford”, OE. ford “ford”, OBr. rit, W. rhyd, OCor. rid “ford”. CCG: §29; WP. II, 39ff; SS: §7.22; IECD, 1003; SOE: 97; IER, 50.

HS: CA furda-tu “opening (in a wall), river-mouth”, orig. “to open up a passage in something, esp. *in a wall*”, Sab. frd “opening in dam wall” (SD, 46), Ug. prš “open” (UG, 534), Heb. prš “a breach in a wall” (OT, 869).

**3.8.35** Proto-IE-HS word [pašh-] “to devour”

IE: Skt. psā- “to devour”, Grk “to chew”. Hitt. pa-aš-zi “drinks, swallows”.

HS: Egyp. pšh “to devour, eat”, perh. CA faḥasu, prob. by metathesis, an approximate translation “taking water/food with the hand and then lick it with the tongue or swallow it”.

**3.8.36** Proto-IE-HS stem [paiš-] “penis”

IE: Skt. pasas- “penis”, Lat. pēnis (from \*pes-nis) id., OHG. faselt id.: PIE \*pes-. SS: §4.492; WP. II, 86; IECD, 929; IEV, 107; E-M, 752; IER, 50.

HS: CA faiša-tu fem. “penis, glans penis” ~ faišala-tu fem. “glans penis”, Ga. fuši “vagina”: PHS [pāš-] “to swell, expand” as in Akk. pāšu “to augment”, OAram. pšš “to enlarge” (AG, 6), CA fašā, fašša “to spread, expand, swell”.

**3.8.37** Proto-IE-HS stem [pus-] “half, side, share”

IE: Lith. pusē “half”, Latv. puse id., Toch. A poši “side, wall”; pošan, pošac “beside”, Hitt. ta-pusa “beside”: PIE \*pus-. IECD, 1011; SS: §13.24.

HS: Ugr. aps “end” (UG, 532), OCan. ’ps “end, extremity”, Phoen. ’ps “provided that, only”, Nab. ps “part, portion” (NWSI I, 97, II, 921), Heb. ’epes “end, extremity” also pss id. (OT, 857).

**3.8.38** Proto-IE-HS word [patah-] “to stretch, open; broad, wide”

IE: Grk petánnūmi “to spread”, Lat. patēre “be open”, Av. paθana- “broad, wide”, Oss. fātān “wide”, OE. bēde “pace, gait”, OIr. ed “space”: PIE \*pet-. IECD, 929; SS: §12.61; DRLE, 158; WP II, 18.

HS: Akk. petū “to open”, CA fataḥa id; futuḥun “broad, wide”, Ug. pth “to open”, Heb. pataḥ “to open” also “be loosen, free”, Phoen., OAram., pth “to open”, Pun. pth “gateway” (NWSI II, 948-951; Ryder, 1974:115).

The words below could be partly related to the words above.

**3.8.38a** IE: OE. fæþm “fathom, thread”, OHG. fadam “a measure of thread from tip to tip of the outstretched arms”, also “open arms”, OSax. paðmōs pl. “open arms”, OW. etem id., Ir. aitheamh “fathom”, etc. All, with m-ext., are derivatives of \*pet- “to open” according to SS: §6.38; WP II, 18; IECD, 907.

HS: CA *fatarā* “to measure with the hand, i.e. *with thumb and little finger outstretched*”; n. *fitru* “span” > SL vb *fadar*, n. *fidr*. Egyp. ptr “thread” is not cognate and its Sem. cognate is *fatīl* id.

It may not be unreasonable to assume that IE and HS words above are remnants of two ancient compounds. They share in common the first part of their compounds \*pat- “open”: cf. OAram. pty “width” (AG, 13), OffAram. pty “breadth, width” (NWSI II, 951), Heb. *pātā* “to open, expand”, Syr. pty “be broad”, etc. (OT, 874), but differ in the second.

### Comments

It seems that IE & HS [pty], [pṭh], [prṭh ~ plṭh], etc. are from a proot [pau or paw], and that this proot lies beneath tens of their traditional roots, if not hundreds as in CA.

**3.8.39** Proto-IE-HS word [pataḥ-] “to ask, pray”, from an ext. of the stem [paty-] in CA CI *fatā*, CIV ’a-*ftā* “to give a legal opinion or verdict”; CX ’istaftā “to ask the opinion of”.

IE: Goth. *bidjan* “to ask, pray”, OE. *biddan*, ON. *biðja* id.: Grk *peíthō* “to persuade”. SS: §18.35; WP. II, 139.

HS: Egyp. pṭh “to ask, pray”, CA *fataḥa*, Koranic (34:26), “examine judicially”; *fātiḥu* “a judge” also “to debate, argue”; *fātaḥa* “to bargain”, Assy. *pitū* “to declare, reveal” (King, 1898: 378), Sab. *ftḥ* “prayer” also “lawsuit, judicial order” (SD, 47).

**3.8.40** Proto-IE-HS stem [pat-] “master”

IE: Skt. *pati-* “master, husband”, Av. *paiti-* id., Opers. *pati* “master”, Grk *pósis* “husband”, Lith. *pats* id. also “self”, Hitt. -*pat* “self”, Toch. A *pats* id., Goth. -*faþs* (in *bruþ-faþs*) “fiancé”: PIE \**poti-*. SS: §19.41; IECD, 982; WP. II, 77; IER, 52f; Meillet, *Introd.* 60, *IEV*, 41.

HS: Egyp. *pt* “a god”, Mand. *pta* “a name of higher being” (MD: 383), Phoen. *m-pt* “dignitary, magistrate, leader”, Heb. *mōpēt* (NWSI II, 674), Nab. *ptwr* “diviner” (NWSI II, 948), CA *fatā* denotes in most pre-Islamic poetry “master, lord, great man”, as in the following two lines of Khansā’s elegy lamenting the death of her brother:

نعم تنأى تفلا مود عورلا دقو ملعا...  
فلدى دنلا ديقو دجلا، أي ىتق،...

According to Kutaibi (see LA), *fatā* = ‘a perfect man’. In MSA *fatā* = “young man”.

**3.8.41** Proto-IE-HS stem [pat] “to fall”

IE: Skt. *pat-* “to fall” also “to fly”, Hitt. *pedai(mi)* “to fly, flee”, Grk *píptō* “to fall”; *pétomai* “to fly”, Lat. *petere* “to seek, go after”. HCG: §85; WP. I, 19ff; SS: §§10.23, 10.37; IECD, 932.

HS: notions of ‘fall’ and ‘seek, go after’ are expressed in HS by two different exts of the stem [pat-]:

a) with š-ext.: Egyp. *ptš* “to fall”: CA *fataša* “to seek, search”;

b) with h-ext.: Egyp. fth “to fall”, CA fathā’u, said of a young eagle, lit. “with pliable or delicate wings so that it will be easily broken if the eagle lands”. The verb *fataha* denotes “the lack of strength in the muscles of feet, joints, and wings”.

However, PHS [pat-] is seen without exts in Egyp. pet “to pursue”, CA fatītu, n., “falling things”, with prefixed h-: ha-fata “to fall”. If /p/ becomes voiced, then /-t/ will be velarized for seq. const.; in this case we get a trilateral hbṭ “fall, go down” as in Ug., CA hbṭ. Both exist in SL with a slight difference in use. To my understanding, the deep meaning seems to be ‘on earth, on foot’.

### 3.8.42 Proto-IE-HS stem [pat-] “to break”, as a n. [put-]

IE: Lat. putāre “to cut, prune”, Cz. pytvat “to dissect”, etc. IECD, 1014; WP. II, 12f; EM, 828f; DRLE, 186.

HS: Egyp. pt(t) “to break, crush”, EHeb. ptt “to break” (NWSI II, 954), CA fatta “to break, crush in pieces; split, cleft”; futātu, coll. (usu. of *bread*) = Heb. pt “a bit, crumb, morsel, e.g. of *bread*”, Eth. ftt “to break bread” (OT, 874), Pun. pt’ < ptt “to cut” (NWSI II, 948).

### 3.8.43 Proto-IE-HS stem [pat-] “to judge”, related to [pat] in §3.7.39 above.

IE: OCS. pytati “to examine, study”, Pol., SCr. pytac’ “to inquire, question”: Lat. putāre also denotes “to think, reckon”.

HS: CA fatā also CIV ’a-ftā, Koranic “to explain, expound” (12:43, 12:46) “to judge, decide, give a legal opinion” (4: 127, 176), BAram. ti-pētāyā pl. “persons learned in the law, lawyers” (OT, 1115), OffAram. pytyw “to decide” (NWSI II, 952), Ga. fita “to conclude, decide”.

CA evidence suggests that the stem is [paut-]. Consider the following negative sentences: lā (not) yu-ftāta (yu- = it, -ftāta is CVIII *pass.*) = lā ya-fūtu (ya- = it, -fūtu *arch. active voice*) “cannot be judged” (see LA r. fwt).

### 3.8.44 Proto-IE-HS stem [paγ-] “bad”

IE: Skt. pāpa- “bad”, Grk pôma “evil, misfortune”.

HS: Egyp. f’w “evil, wicked, wrong”, CA fayā “bad”, perh. Phoen., Pun. p’m “terror, trouble” (NWSI II, 929).

### 3.8.45 Proto-IE-HS stem [paγ-] “boy, child”

IE: Grk païs “child”, Skt. putra- “son”, puθra- id., Lat. puer “boy”. IECD, 909; EM, 782, SS: §2.25; DRLE, 166.

HS: Ug. p̄y “son, offspring”; p̄yt “girl” (UG, 536, 533), Egyp. p’-t “mankind”.

### 3.8.46 Proto-IE-HS stem [pi’-] “to hate”

IE: Skt. pīy- “to revile, abuse”, Goth. faian “to blame”; fījan “to hate”, ON. fjā “to hate”, OE. fēon id.; fēond “enemy, evil”: PIE \*piX-, SL, 290; IECD: 935; SS: §16.41; IER, 47; WP. II, 9; SOE: 150.

HS: Egyp. f’θ “be despised, condemned”, f’w “wicked, evil, wrong”, CA fa’ita “to slander, fabricate lies”.

### 3.8.47 Proto-IE-HS word [pu't-] “food”

IE: Goth *fōdeins* “food”, OE. *fōds*, OCS. *pišta* id., Skt. *pituh* “food”, Lith. *pītas* “food”: PIE \*pī-. IECD, 941; WP. II, 73.

Buck (SS: §5.12) considers IE \*pī- a derivative of \*pā- “to feed” as in Lat. *pāscere*, etc. However, IE \*pī- and \*pā- are actually regarded as two different roots by some other Indoeuropeanists.

HS: a possible HS cognate is the root in Egyp. p't “bread, cake, food”, prob. Housa *fuud* “soup”, Bed. *fūti*, Af. *fūta*, Sa. *fūta* id.<sup>303</sup>

In both Egyp. and Grm. the root expresses “to bear, bring forth”: cf. Egyp. p'p' id., OE. *bēdan*, ON. *fæða* “to bear” also “to feed”, Goth. *fōdjan* “to feed”.

### 3.8.48 Proto-IE-HS word [pay'- or fai'-] “to give”.

IE: Hitt. *pai-* “to give” also “to go”. Sturtevant-Hahn (HCG: §76) and Benveniste (1973: 67) consider the Hitt. word as a compound of the pre-verb \*p- and root \*ai-, expressing, according to Benveniste, “attribute, allocate”. The root is seen in Toch. *ai* “to give”, Grk *aísa* “fate”, Av. *aēta-* “part”, Osc. *aeteis* “partis”. Sturtevant-Hahn reconstruct IH \*-he'y-.

HS: CA CIV 'a-fā'a “to bestow” also “go back, return”; fa'awa (belonging to root f'y or fy': see LA) “to divide”; fai'u “flock (lit. ‘parts’) of birds”; fi'atu “sect, group”, lit. ‘one group among others groups’, i.e. ‘part’, Shil. *fi* “to give” (Applegate, 1958:52), Egyp. f'í “to present”, as in f'í ḥḏ “to present (an offering of) silver”.

HS [pa'y-/w-] is a compound of [p-] and proot \*'ay/w-. The proot is perhaps the one in CA 'āsa or 'awasa [ʾws] (but with /-w-/ instead of \*/-y-/), “to give”; 'ausu “a gift”. The basic meaning of CA 'awasa is actually “to compensate for”, i.e. ‘to give as compensation’, OSA 'ws “to give, compensate for”, Tham. 's, ws, OSA 'ws. Heb. 'wš “to give”, Ugr 'uš-n “gift” (Shehadeh, 1968: 64; DRS, I, 13), Egyp. 's “an offering”.

#### Comments

To my understanding of the basic meaning of [py'] and various related meanings expressed by all its derivatives, the initial [pa-] is ultimately the same as that discussed in §2.17.13 above, and the orig. signification of the IE-HS word is ‘give back’.

The same proot is also present in CA *arch*. 'a-hā'u “I (= 'a-) give, take”, pass. 'u-hā'u “be given, taken”; *hā'* is a term used when you ask one to *hand you something, to give you something. It is to this stem belong such HS trilaterals as* [hty] and [hdy]: see §2.11.6 above.

It is needless to say that CA [f'd]: vb *fāda* “benefit”, n. *fā'ida-tu* “benefit” and its HS cognates (see §2.12.15, n. 3 above) are certainly derived from IE-HS [pai'].

### 3.8.49 Proto-IE-HS stem [pah-] “be strong, to protect”

<sup>303</sup> HS still has another word \**pat-* signifying “to eat; food” as in Heb. *pat* “bread”, CA *fatta-tu* “a kind of food”, Egyp. *pt* “food, bread”, Assy. *patānu* “to eat”, Ga. *fatfota* “a kind of bread”, etc. all are related to [pat-] “to break” (§3.8.42 above).



IE: Hitt. pahhašmi “I protect”, Skt. pāti “protects”, Lat. pāscō “I protect, feed, pasture”, OCS. pasa “I pasture”, Tock. pāsk- “to protect”: PIE \*pā-. Sturtevant (IHL: §36e) reconstructs IH \*peX-. IECD, 897; WP. II, 71.

HS: Egyp. p’h “to attack”, fh “to raid, destroy”, Assy. piḫū “to steer; steer man, pilot”; piḫi “to shut, close”; pahātu “governor”, OAram. pḥh “governor” (AG, 13), Akk. pahātu, OffAram. id. (NWSI II, 904).

With r-ext.: Assy. uppahhir “to strengthen, collect”; puhur “might, strength, forces” (King, 1898: 375), Sab. fhr “to challenge” (SD, 44), CA faḥara “to glory, boast”; fāhiru “great, magnificent”; ma-fhara-tu “feat”, Hatra pḥr “banquet, assembly” (NWSI II, 907).

To this Proto-IE-HS stem apparently belong:

3.8.49a Grk ém-paios “expert” = Egyp. ph “prudent”.

3.8.49b OCS. pojo, pēti “to sing” = CA fāha “to sound”.

**3.8.50** Proto-IE-HS word [pa’m] “to fatten”; [pi’-] “fat” < [pa’] “to eat (take into the mouth)” < pū “mouth” as in CA fa’ima “be fat”: CX ’ista-fā “to eat to excess”; faiyihu “glutton”: piḫ, pūh, etc. “mouth”, Akk. pū, Ug., Phoen. p id.

IE: Skt. pī- “to fatten, swell, overflow”; pīvas, adj., “fat”; pīvan “swelling, full, fat”; pitus “juice, drink, food”, Av. pivas “fat”, Oss. fīw id., Grk píōn “fat, rich”, pīar “fat, grease”, Lith. pienas “milk”: pīnus “pine”, Grk pītus id.: PIE \*pī-, \*pei-. IECD, 942; SS: §8.64; WP. II, 74; IER, 47; DRLE, 1559; SOE: 149. Sturtevant (IHL: §69a) reconstructs IH \*piA-.

HS: CA fa’ima “be fat”; mu-f’amu “fat, fleshy, full”; fa’ama “fill to excess”; ’a-f’ama “to enlarge, augment” also “overflow”; fi’āmu “a group of many people”, Eth. f’m “to have in the mouth (a morsel, lump, etc.)”, Heb. \*pā’am, obsol. “to fill the mouth with food” (OT, 832), preserved in *pīmah* “fat, grease”. A variant *fa’mu* also exists in CA and expresses “fat, fleshy, full (= fat) *of face, of upper arm, thighs, etc.*”.

When CA *fa’ama* applies to animals, it signifies “fill the mouth with *grass*”: Grk, Ionic ποίη “grass”.

**3.8.51** Proto-IE-HS stem [pai-] “to exist; mankind”

IE: Hitt. pupus “paramour, lover, adulterer”, Grk ὠπυσμαι “take to wife, marry”, Skt. pus- “support”: PIE \*pou-, \*peu-, with a general meaning “be, exist”.

HS: Egyp. pywt, pl., “man”: py ~ p’ “to be exist”, CA -fa “be, exist” (see §2.20.5 above), CA fayam ~ fi’āmu “a group of people”, Har. fōya “to settle down”. To this stem may also belong with n-ext. CA faunu “growth”.

**3.8.52** Proto-IE-HS word [puḥl-] “strong; testicle”

IE: Lat. pollēre “be strong”; pollex “thumb”: Skt. phala- “testicle”. SS: §4.342; EM, 785f.

HS: CA faḥlu “strong” also “vigorous male animal”: Akk. puhallu “vigorous male animal” (NWSI II, 906) also “testicle”, Syr. paḥalta id., Soq. faḥal “penis”.

**3.8.53** Proto-IE-HS word [puḥ-t-] “strength, strong”

IE: Skt. sphāti “strong, big”: PIE \*(s)peX-. PIEP: §9.3a.

HS: Egyp. pḥt “strength, might, power”.

**3.8.54** Proto-IE-HS stem [paḥ-] “widen”

IE: Skt. sphīta “wide” is related to sphāti above and to words in §3.8.56 below. PIEP: §9.3a.

HS: \*paḥ “to stretch, widen”, seen with various exts in CA faḥasa “to stretch; flat”, fḥn “wide, broad”, fḥš “very large, great”, fḥk “large”; Heb. pḥs “flatten”, etc.

A form with /s-/, like that of Skt, is Eth. sfḥ “to spread out”, CA ma-sfūḥa-tu fem. “wide” as in the PIP of A’sha:

«bi ma-*sfūḥa*-ti (’a)l ’ābāṭi ’uryānati (’a)l ḵurā...» (LA).

Also, ṣafīḥa-tu fem. (fr. \*safīḥa-tu) “wide”; ṣaffaḥa “widen”.

**3.8.55** Proto-IE-HS stem [peḥ-] “side”.

IE: OHG. fiara “side”, Goth. fēra id.<sup>304</sup>; Skt. sphara- “spread out, wide”. PIEP: §9.3a.

HS: Egyp. pḥ “end”, CA ṣafḥu “side”.

**3.8.56** Proto-IE-HS stem [paḥ-] “to blow” as a n. [puḥ-]

IE: Lith. pūsti “to blow”, Arm. phukh id., Skt. phūt-karah “act of blowing, breathing, whistling”. Meillet, Introd. 64; SS: §10.40.

HS: CA faḥḥa “to blow, snore”, PChad. \*f-, or \*p- “to blow”, Heb. pīḥā “to puff, blow, breathe” (OT, 837).

**3.8.57** Proto-IE-HS word [peḥg-] “thigh, buttock”

IE: Skt. sphij “thigh, buttock”, OE. spic “bacon fat”, ON. spik “bladder”. IECD, 1271.

HS: Egyp. pḥ-wi, dual, “thigh, buttock”, CA ’a-fḥaḡu “with uneven thighs, with deviating thigh”.

**3.8.58** Proto-IE-HS word [paḥad-] “to split”

IE: Skt. sphut- “to split”, Br. fauta id. IECD, 1270; SS: §9.27.

HS: Egyp. pḥḏ “to split”, CA faḥada “to break”, Phoen. pḥṣ “to break, crush”.

**3.8.59** Proto-IE-HS word [paḥr-] “to circle, go round, encircle”; [piḥ-r-] “sphere, ball”

IE: Grk sphaīra “ball”, Lith. spiras “globule, ball”. IECD, 1266.

HS: Egyp. pḥ’r “make a circuit, encircle, go round about, revolve”; s-pḥ’r caus. “make to go round, surround”, CA fi(n)hira-tu [fḥr] “one who walks or moves with a rolling motion”.

**3.8.60** Proto-IE-HS word [ṣapaḥ-] “to scatter”

IE: Grk speirō “to scatter”, Lat. spargere “to scatter, sprinkle”, OIr. sernaim “to scatter”, OHG. sperren “to stretch”: PIE \*sphēr-. IECD, 1255; WP. II, 670ff; SS: §9.34.

---

<sup>304</sup> Otherwise, the Grm. words are from a root in CA fiyāru “side”.

HS: Assy. šapāhu “to scatter” (King, 1898: 393), CA safahja “to shed (tears, blood), pour out”.

**3.8.61** Proto-IE-HS word [šaparh-], with caus. /ša-/ in IE, CA uses /’a-/ in ’afraha or CII farahha.

IE: Skt. spharāmi “to discharge, diffuse”, Hitt. sparhi “to spread”. IECD, 1267; WP. II, 668.

HS: CA farraha “to sprout” also “to spread”; ta-frīhu “sprouting, germination”; farhu “seeds about to give off shoots”; *farraha* ’ar-rau’u, and impert. ’afrih rau’uka, both preserved as proverbs, “relieve (i.e. *discharge*) of fear” (rau’u “fear”), Heb. pāraḥ “to break out or forth, to put forth buds, leaves, to flourish, to blossom, as *a tree*” (OT, 866).

**3.8.62** Proto-IE-HS word [’ipr-] “ground, field”

IE: Grk épeiros “mainland”: OE. ofer “shore”, MHG. uover id.: PIE \*āpero. SS: §1.26; WP. I, 47.

HS: Akk. ipru “field”, OAb. eperu “earth, soil, dust”, Heb. ’ēper “dry land, dust”, Aram. ’epūr “land, meadow”, Ug. ’pr, CA ’afru “soil, dust (of the earth)”, Eth. ’afar “dust, earth, soil” (Tyloch, 1975: 56, n. 5), Egyp. ’p’p “ground, earth”.

**3.8.63** Proto-IE-HS stem [’ap-] “further, again, back”

IE: Hitt. appa “afterward, again”, apō “off, away, back”, Skt. apa “away, after”, Av. apa id., Goth. af, OHG. aba “away, from”, OIr. fo- id. Other IE derivatives are:

Skt. apara- “back, later, further”, Av. aparō id., OIr. far, for “behind”, ON. efri “later”, Goth., OHG. afara;

Skt. apam “farthest”, Hitt. appan “afterward”;

Skt. apataram “farthest, following”, OHG. aftaro, OE. æfter “after”, etc. all of them are derived from PIE \*apo-. IECD: 28ff; WP. I, 47-50; SL, 285; HCG: §§76, 85; IHL: §64a; IER, 3.

HS: Akk. appūna “further(more), thus”, CA ta-fī’a, ta-’ifa “after, following”, also “at the time of ” = ’iffānu “at the proper time and at first” (“first” as opposing to “later, subsequent”), OArām. ’p “further”, ’pm “again, still”, ’pw “also” (AG, 8), Phoen. ’p “also, even” (PG, 80), Palm. ’p “also, moreover, even” (NWSI I, 93).

It is less likely that Akk. apālu, with l-ext., “be late, behind”; apl “heir, son”, OArām. ’pl “late born lamb” = OE. eafora “son, heir”, Goth. afara id.

**3.8.64** Proto-IE-HS word for “four”

IE: Ved. catvāras, Lat. quattuor, OCS. četyre, OIr. cethir “four”; Ved. catuṣ-pad “four-footed”, Grk tetrá-pod- id., Lat. quadru-ped- id.: \*k<sup>w</sup>etwōr. Indoeuropeanists consider Goth. and common Grm. *fidwor* “four” as cognate. The principle followed here is that *since IE and Grm. words express “four”, they must be cognate regardless of the remarkable phonetic difference in their first radicals*. Moreover, they do not bother to cite at least *few examples* showing that PIE initial \*k<sup>w</sup>- > Grm. /f/ initially as *scientific linguistics* demands.

All words above are either from a cpd word \*ka-padwār- = Egyp. fdw “four” (for \*ka-, see §2.17.83) or from a cpd \*kau-padwār “four-footed”: \*kau = CA šawā “four-footed”; CA šaṭru ~ šaṭru “2 of 4”: see §2.17.25 above. The same word has already been discussed in §2.25, n. 10a above.

### 3.8.65 Proto-IE-HS stem [‘ap-] “bee”

IE: Lat. apis “bee”, OCz. ap-oka “honeycomb”. IECD, 29.

HS: Egyp. ‘f “bee”, CA ‘ufāfa-tu fem. “honey” (cf. Siyyuti, I. 408; LA).

### 3.8.66 Proto-IE-HS word [‘apš-] “to work, do; work”

IE: Skt. apas “work” also, as adj., “active”, Hitt. appas “workman”, Lat. opus “work, deed”, opēs “power”, OE. æfnan “to perform, work”; afof, ON. afl “power”: PIE \*op-. IECD, 881; SS: §9.12; WP. I, 175f; EM, 708f; DRLE, 139; IER, 64.

HS: Akk. epēšu “to do, make” (AG, 73, Gelb, 1961: 182), Assy. epištu “deed, action” as verb “to do, make” (King, 1898: 330), CA ‘afsu “toil, action”, Egyp. psys, with loss of initial ‘-, “toil”. SL ti-‘fīs “anything done/performed/worked badly” as a vb CII ‘affas.

### 3.8.68 Proto-IE-HS stem [pal-] “to flee”

IE: OE. flēon “to flee”, OHG. fliohan id.

HS: Sab. t-flw “to flee in disorder”, CA falla “to flee”; ‘infalla “to retreat, be defeated”, Shil. t-fal “to leave”, Ga. fula, Som. fule “coward”,

With s-ext.: Sab. fls, “to put to flight, flee”; the /-s/ may be caus. occurring as a suffix (see §2.2.57 above).

### 3.8.69 Proto-IE-HS word [putain-] “vessel”

IE: Grk patánē “dish” > Lat. patina “pan”. SS §5.25.

HS: Egyp. pydn “metal vessel”, CA futainu, prob. dimin. of *fatana*, “jug”.

### 3.8.70 Proto-IE-HS stem [pid- or paid-] “pot”

IE: Lith. puodas “pot”, Latv. puods id. OE. fæt “vessel”, OHG. vaz id. SS: §5.26.

HS: Egyp. pydn “pot”, CA fīdām “jug”.

### 3.8.71 Proto-IE-HS word [pauq] “pine, wood”

IE: Grk peúkē “pine tree”, OPruss. peuse, Lith. pušis id., OIr. ochtach, Alb. pishë id.: PIE \*peuk-. SS: §8.64; WP. II, 15; IECD, 931.

HS: CA fāḫu [fwḫ] “pine tree”, Egyp. pwg “piece of wood, stick”.

### 3.8.72 Proto-IE-HS stem [pat-] “tired”

IE: Lat. fatīscere “become weak, faint”; fatīgātus “tired”

HS: perh. Egyp. fetfet “be tired out, wearied”, CA fatta, in the fixed expression *fatta min* ‘*adadihi*, “weaken”.

### 3.8.73 Proto-IE-HS word [pu’θ-] “be dirty”

IE: Lat. pūtere “be rotten, stink”, Skt. pū- “rot, stink”, Av. pū- “rot”, Lith. puti id.  
HS: Egyp. fʿθ “be dirty”.

### 3.8.74 Proto-IE-HS stem [pəl-] “fortified place”

IE: Skt. pur- “stronghold, fortified place”, pura- “town, city”, Grk pólis “city, citadel”, Lat. pils “castle”.

HS: Egyp. pr “place, seat of government, house”, Phoen. m-plh “ruins”, m-ply “huts, cottages”.

### 3.8.75 Proto-IE-HS stems [ʾap- ~ ʾab-] “water”, [ʾab] (fr. ʾa ʾab) “flood”, [hap] (fr. hʾ ʾap) “flood, river”, etc.

IE: Hitt. hapa “flood, river”, Lith. upė “river”, Toch. B ap “river, water”, Skt. āp- “water”: PIE āp-, i.e. Xap-. WP. I, 46.

Mann (IECD, 1) considers Lat. amnis (\*ab-nis), OIr. and common Celtic ap “water”, and Alb. âmë id. as derivatives of PIE \*abhnis. Buck (SS: §1.36) reconstructs \*āp- and \*ab-.

HS: Assy. abūbu “flood”, CA ʾububu ~ ʾububu “water pouring forth copiously”; ʾubābu ~ ʾubābu “rushing stream, flood”, Som. ʾab “to drink”, Ga. obaso “water”. See §2.2.22 above.

HS: Egyp., hefhēf, by reduplication, “flood”, etc.

### 3.8.76 Proto-IE-HS stem [bay-] “to drink”

IE: Skt. pibati “drinks”, Lat. bibere “to drink”, Hitt. paš- id., OCS. piti id., OIr. ibim, Cor. eve, Br. eva, Alb. pī id.: PIE \*pō-, \*pī- (i.e. \*poX- or \*piX-). IECD, 933; SS: §5.13, Meillet, Introd. 61; CCG: §29; WP. II, 71. Burrow (SL, 72) reconstructs PIE \*peH<sup>3</sup>-.

HS: Egyp. bʾbʾ “to sip”, CA baybay “to drink”; buyaibiyu “spring, well”; baybaya-tu “drinking”: PHS \*bay-bay-. The root \*bay- is also seen with different exts in CA as in bayara “to drink to an excess”, bayšu “light rain”, bayyu “copious rain”, etc., Egyp. bʾr “mass of water”, bʾn “stream”, bʾwḥw “flood”, bʾḥ “water”, etc.

### 3.8.77 Proto-IE-HS word for “nephew, grandson”

IE: Lat. nepōs “nephew”, W. nai, OCor. noi id., Skt. napāt- “grandson”, OPers. napā id., Grk népodes, pl., “child”: PIE \*nepōt-. SS: §2.53; WP. I, 329ff; IECD, 836; Meillet, Introd. 351, CCG: §30; IEV, 40f.

Indoeuropeanists believe, however, that PIE \*nepot- is a compound word consisting of \*ne- “not” (cf. Skt. na “not”, etc.) and \*pot- “master” (cf. Skt. pati “master”, etc.), thus the original meaning of the compound is ‘powerless’. Although HS does not have the compound \*ne-pot-, it nevertheless has its two component elements: \*n- “not” as in Egyp. n id., etc. and \*pat- “master” (§3.8.40 above). This is a naïve and funny analysis of the word. The correct analysis is that the word consists of [na-] “descendant”, ultimately identical with CA [na-] of naḡlu, etc. see §2.3.11 above, plus [pat] “master”.

A important question arises here: *is there any ultimate connection between the 2<sup>nd</sup> part of the IE compound and that of CA ḥafīd “nephew”* (note that \*ḥafīt does not exist in the language).

### 3.8.78 Proto-IE-HS stem [baqai-] or [paqai-] “cattle”

IE: Skt. paću- “head of cattle”, Av. pasus “small cattle”, OLat. pecu “cattle”, cheep”, Umbr. pequo “small cattle”, OLith. pekus “cattle”, OE. feoh, OHG. fihu “cattle”: PIE \*peḱu-, derived from the root in Grk pékō “to shear” , etc. §3.8.3 above. According to this view, IE \*peḱu- meant orig. “sheep”, which are the bearer of the *fleece*. SS: §3.15; IECD, 914f; WP. II, 16f; EM, 746ff.

HS: Akk. buṣaru “cattle”, Heb. bāḱār, Aram. baḱrā “cattle, oxen, cows”, CA baṣaru “oxen, cows”, Sab. bḱr “cattle”: CA baḱara “to cut through, rip open”; baḱīru “a kind of sleeveless garment”, prob. made of *cowhide*.

In the light of the data just cited above, the question naturally arises: *are IE \*peḱu- and HS \*buṣa-r cognates?* Before attempting to answer the question , a point must be made in connection with the derivation of IE \*peḱu- “cattle” from \*peḱo- “to shear”. It is quite reasonable and logical to assume that \*peḱo- is derived from \*peḱu, and not vice-versa, since the law of nature presupposes the existence of a word for ‘*sheep*’, *the bearer of ‘fleece’*, before a word signifying “*to remove the fleece*”. If the verb \*peḱo- had existed in the IE community before the appearance of “sheep”, then its meaning would have been “*to comb*”, but not “*to shear*”. Evidence supporting this supposition comes from CA firḱ “sheep”. The root is clearly from [fḱr], an old variant of [bḱr], or vice-versa. Derivatives of this root are: faraḱa “to divide” also “to dress or arrange the hair with a comb”; ma-friḱu “comb”; farīḱa-tu “herd of sheep” also firḱu id.

In answering the question just raised above, we may say that there is some evidence pointing to the possible existence of a Proto-compound form \*p-qy- (or \*qai-), where \*p- is variant of [ba’] and \*qai- is a proot for “sheep, goats”. The root is still alive in Egyp. ḱy “goat”, CA ḱāru (r. ḱyr), coll., “sheep”, and with prefixed /w-/: waḱīru id. and perh, OIr. cāera id<sup>305</sup>. This makes the original signification of ba-qai- ~ pa-qai- “large cattle” and not “small cattle”.

### 3.8.79 Proto-IE-HS proot [pī-] “on, upon”

IE: Skt. pi, pi- (in pi-dhā, etc.), Grk pi- (in pi-ézō, etc.), Lat. -pe (in nem-pe, etc.), OIr. fī- Lith -pi, etc. “on, upon”. IECD, 934).

HS: CA fī “on, upon” as in the Koran: ‘an būrika man fī (’a)n nāri (see LA). Some other meanings expressed by the prep. are “in, at, after, etc.”.

### 3.8.80 Proto-IE-HS word [parm-] “farm house”

IE: Hitt. parna “farm building”. HIL: §41g.

HS: Egyp. prm’ pl. “summer house”.

### 3.8.81 Proto-IE-HS word [par-’-t-] “battle”, related to [par-’-] in §3.7.20 above.

<sup>305</sup> Some derive the OIr. word from PIE \*kaperō-, in Lat. caper “he-goat”, etc., but see §3.3.16 above.

IE: Skt. *ṛṭanā-* “battle”, OPers. *partara* id., Av. *pərət-* “to fight”, OCS. *pîrēti se*, “to fight”, etc. are from PIE *\*pṛt-*: IECD, 1003; SS: §20.11; WP. II, 42.

HS: Egyp. *pr-t* “battle-field”: *pr* “battle”, CA *faraʿa* “to strike”; *ʿu-friʿa*, pass., “be captured and killed”; *fārūʿatu* “hoe, ax”, Heb. *pāraʿ* “to punish, avenge”, JAram. *prʿ-* “punishment” (NWSI II, 943).

**3.8.82** Proto-IE-HS stem [pag-] “to cleave, break, open”. IE words have a caus. *s-*.

IE: Grk. *spházō* “to cut, slay”, MHG. *spachen* “to crack, burst”. IECD, 1251.

HS: Egyp. *pg* “to cleave, divide, open”, CA *faḡā* “to open”.

### 3.9 *PROTO-IE-HS* /b/

Proto-IE-HS /b/ is a voiced bilabial stop. It is in IE /bh/, a voiced aspirated stop (/b/ is rare) and in PHS /b/, a voiced unaspirated stop.

#### 3.9.1 Proto-IE-HS proot [bi] “by, in, at”

IE: Goth. bi “by, about, around”, OE bi “by, in, at, about, concerning”, Hitt. -pi “in” (as in *sana-pi* “in one place”), Ved. bhi, loc., Grk -phi, etc. IECD, 77.

HS: Ug., Phoen., OAram. b-, Eth. ba-, ESA b- “in, at, on, by, with, means of, because” (DRS II, 39), Heb. bi “by, with, in, at, on, because, as, among” (OT, 105-108), CA bi “by, in, at, with, because, by means of”, Har. be “in, on, with” (HED, 39).

#### 3.9.2 Proto-IE-HS stem [bad-] “to perceive, become aware of”

IE: Skt. budh- “to perceive, understand”; bodhati “he learns, he is awake”, Lith. budėti “be awake”, OE. bodian “keep watch, be awake”, OFris. bodia id.: PIE \*bhudhō-, \*bheudh-. IECD, 75, 119; WP. II, 147; SOE: §218; IEV, 248; IER, 8, HGG: §191, n.8.

HS: CA CA badā “to appear, seem”; CIV ’abdā “to show” also “express one’s view”; badā’u “opinion, point of view”; bādi-n “clear, evident”; badiyyu “first”, bada’a “to invent, devise and do first”; bad’u “a wise young man, counselor” (= Skt. budhah “wise”), OffAram. bd’ “to invent”, Jp., Syr. beda id., Heb. bādā “to invent, devise” (DRS II, 44; OT, 112).

With infix -y- and -w-: CA bāda = badā in meaning.

With h-ext.: budāhiya-tu ~ badīha-tu “quick perception” (= Av. boadah- “perception”, Skt. bodh- “understanding”).

Some derivatives of [bad-] are below.

3.9.2a IE: Lith. budrus “alert”, OCS. būdrū id., Av. budrō id.

HS: CA badara “be quick” also, lit., “hasten and be the first to take action, be quick to act”, Ge. badara “be speedy, to forestall”, Te. badra “to hasten, precede” (DRS II, 46), Tham. bdr “hate-toi” (Branden, 1950: 511).

3.9.2b IE: OE. bēodan “to bid”, OHG. biotan “to offer”.

HS: CA badda “to bid”, i.e. *make an offer to buy or sell against someone’s offer*; ’abadda “to give”, Sab. bd “currency” (SD, 26), Som. bed “to pay a debt”.

3.9.2c Grk puthōn “creature”, OE budda “beetle”, Old Norwegian budda “young animal”, Ir. bod “boor” = CA badī’u “creature”.

#### 3.9.3 Proto-IE-HS stem [bad-] “to perish”

IE: Grk péthō “to suffer”, Skt. bādā “pain”, Lith. badas “hunger”, Latv. bads id.: PIE \*bhādāh-, \*bhēdh-. SS: §5.14; IECD, 58; WP. II, 130.



HS: Phoen. bdd “to destroy”, Tham. bd “to perish”, Ge. badbada “to perish, disappear”, Akk. abātu “to perish, be lost”, OArām., Ug., Phoen., Heb. ’bd “to perish, go to ruin”, CA ’abāda id. See §2.3.3 above.

### 3.9.4 Proto-IE-HS stem [bau’-] “to dwell, live; be”

IE: Goth. *bauan* “to dwell”, ON. *būa* id., OSax., OE. *bū* “dwelling”, Alb. *buj* “to dwell, live”, W. *byw* id., Lith. *buti* “to be”; *butas* “house”, Skt. *bhū-* “to become, be”, Av. *bū-* id., Lat. *fu-ī* “I was”, OE. *bēon* “to be”: PIE \**bheu-*. IEV, 248; SOE: §128; IECD, 116; SS: §9.91; WP, II, 140f; DRLE, 21; IER, 8. Lehmann (PIEP: §7.5) reconstructs \**bhewX-*.

HS: CA *bawa’a* “to settle in a place, dwell”; with *bī’a-tu* “home”, Egyp. *bw* “house, place”, etc. see §2.9.29 & 2.21.5.6 above.

IE-HS words are related to [bau’-] “dwell, be”.

3.9.4a IE: ON. *býr* “town, village”, Dan. *by* “city”, Sw. *by* “village”.

HS: Ga. *biya* “country, district”, CA *bī’a-tu*, *bā’a-tu* “home of people (tribe) in any place”; *ma-bā’a-tu* “enclosure for animals”, Egyp. *bwy* “place”, Amh. *bota* “place”.

3.9.4b IE: Lat. *superbus* “proud”, a compound of *super-* “over” and *-bus* fr. \**bheuX-*. cf. SS: §16.48.

HS: CA *bī’a-tu* “arrogant, boastful”, Egyp. *bw’* “to magnify” and also “be marvelous” (EHD I, 215) = Grk upper-phēs “marvelous”.

3.9.4c IE: Grk *phūs* “son”, Lith. *būvis* “creature”.

HS: Egyp. *bw’* “chief, nobleman, lord” (EHD I, 215), CA *bawā’u* “peer, match”, *bauw* “young (lit. *son*) of she-camel”, with l-ext.: *baulu* “son”.

3.9.4d IE: OCS. *bylī* “nobleman”, Alb. *bijë*, dial. *bilë* “daughter”, Lat. *filius* id., etc. IECD, 129, 121f.

HS: CA *baulu* “son”; \**baula-tu* would be “daughter”.

3.9.4e IE: Skt. *bhāva-* “feeling, emotion”.

HS: CA *’ibtaha’a*, CVIII of [bwh], “to feel comfortable with someone and love to be with him” as in PIP of A’sha:

«wa fī ’al-ḥaiyi man yahwā hawānā wa ya-*btahī*...» (LA).

A close cognate to CA is NWS *bwt* “desire” (NWSI I, 148).

### 3.9.5 Proto-IE-HS stem [bhah-] “to shine”

IE: Skt. *bhā-* “to shine”; *bhās-* “light” Av. *bā-* “to shine”; *bānus* “ray”, Oss. *bon* “day”, Grk *phainō* “to show, bring to light”; *phānos*, OIr. *ban* “white”: PIE \**bhā-*. SS: §15.56; WP, II, 122f; IECD, 65, DRLE, 16; IER, 5.

HS: CA *bahiya* “to shine”; *bāhī* “shining”; *bahā’u* “splendor, brilliance, beauty”, Heb. *bhy* “be clear, pure”, Mand. *bhy* “to shine forth, be illuminated”. See §2.13.24, esp. *Comments* III above.

**3.9.6** Proto-IE-HS stem [bah-] “to speak, say”, related to [bah-] “to shine” above.

IE: Grk phēmi, Dor. phāmi “to say”, Lat. fāri “to speak”; fāma “report”, Phryg. ba “to say, to speak”, OCS. bojati “to tell”, Toch. pā- “to beg”, Arm. bay “word”, OE. bōian “to boast”, W. ban “loud”. SS: §18.21; IECD, 61, 68; IEV, 247; EM, 375f; Lehmann (PIEP: §9.4b) reconstructs \*bheX-.

HS: CA bāhā “to boast”, Tham. bh “se rappeler”, Egyp. b’b’ “to converse” also “to speak in a contradictory manner”. See §2.13.24, *Comments* III above.

#### *Comments*

HS proot [bai-] also expresses a meaning similar to [bah-] above, hence such IE words as Skt. bhānu- “brightness, sun”, Av. bānus “ray”, Grk suko-phāntēs “prominent”, phānos, Ir. ban “white, bald”, etc. = CA baiyin “visible, manifest”, bāna “be clear, evident, visible”; babāniyyā-tu pl. arch. “kind of stars used to guide people”, bayānu “eloquence, elocution”, baiyina-tu = burhānu = evidence, etc. see §2.13.24, n. 5b above. Here also belong CA bān, Sab. bwn “bān-tree”, fr. “*brightness*”.

**3.9.7** Proto-IE-HS proot [bai-] or [bī-] “bee, honey”

IE: OE. bēo “bee”, OHG. bīa id., Lith. bitē, bitis “bee”, OCS. bīčela id., Ir. beach id., Hind. bhiṛ “wasp”: PIE \*bī-: SS: §3.83; WP. II, 184f; IECD, 80.

HS: Egyp. b’-t “honey” (EHD I, 201).

**3.9.8** Proto-IE-HS word [bu’r- ~ bi’r-] “well, spring”

IE: Grk phrear “well”, Goth. bruna id., OE. burna, OHG. brunno “spring”, Arm. albiur “well”<sup>306</sup>. WP. II, 157f; SS: §1.37; IER, 9.

HS: Akk. būru, būr-tu “well”, CA bi’ru id. (bu’ra-tu “pit”), Moab. br, Heb. bōr, OAram. byr’, ESA b’r id. The root is also seen in the CA compound birbāsu “deep well”. See §2.17.56 above.

**3.9.9** Proto-IE-HS stem [bāk-, baik-] “to buy, sell”

IE: Goth. bugjan “to buy”; fra-bugjan “to sell”, OS. buggian “to buy”, OE. bycgan id. SS: §11.82.

HS: CA bāka “to buy” also “to sell”, Egyp. b’k “price, wages” (EHD I, 206).

**3.9.10** Proto-IE-HS stem [bay-] “to flee; fear”

IE: Grk phépomai “to flee in terror”, phóbos “fear”, Lith. bēgti “to flee”, OCS. vѣžati id., Skt. bhājak “quickly”: PIE \*bhēg-. IECD, 69; WP. II, 248; IEV, 247; IER, 6.

HS: Heb. bā’at “to fear, be terrified; terror” (OT, 149), Jb. b’t “be anxious; anguish, distress” (DRS II, 76), Som. bagho “fear” (Kirk, 1905: 208-209), CA bayata “to come upon suddenly, attack unexpectedly, surprise”.

<sup>306</sup> Arm. *albiur* above is a loan from CA al bīr “the well”. Latin, English and other European languages have retained CA ’al “the” in a good many loanwords from Arabic such as *algebra*, *alcohol*, *alkali*, etc. It is most likely that ON. ulfaldi “camel”, but originally “elephant”, contains this same article: CA al-filu “the elephant”, ON. fill “elephant”.

**3.9.11** Proto-IE-HS stem [baih-, bauh-] “be afraid, coward, weak”

IE: Av. byah- “fear”, Skt. bhaya- “fear, danger”, Lith. bijos “to fear”, baile ~ baime “fear”, Latv. bija id. SS: §16.53; IEV, 147; WP. II, 124; IECD, 79.

HS: Egyp. bwhy “coward, fugitive, he who flies” (EHD I, 215), CA būha-tu [r. bwh] “weak (man)”.

**3.9.12** Proto-IE-HS stem [bau’-] “good, wonderful, pleasant”

IE: Skt. bhavilah “good, lecher”; bhāvitah “elated”, Pers. buye “hope, desire”, Ir. babhaim “sweeten”, OE. bȳwan “to polish, adorn”. IECD, 76f.

HS: Egyp. by’-t “wonderful, marvelous” ~ bw’-t pl., id.: by-t “moral worth, disposition, reputation”; byn “sweet, pleasant”, (EHD I, 209ff), CA ba’wu, ba’wā’u “glory”: bā’ā “be glorious” (Albright, JAOS 47, 213, n. 26).

With l-ext. (as in Skt.): Akk. ba’alu “être anormalement grand, important, très lumineux (étoile)”. DRS II, 40.

**3.9.13** Proto-IE-HS stem [ba’š-] “disgrace, badness”

IE: OHG. bōsi “vain, worthless, bad”, bōsa “badness”, Norw. baus “impudent, proud”, Fris. boas “bad (of weather)”, ME. bost “brag”; bosten “to brag” > NE. *boast*. SS: §16.72.

HS: Akk. ba’āšu “be bad”, Ug. b’š id. (UG, 530), OAram. b’š “bad, evil” (AG, 9), OffAram., JAram., Hatra., Palm. b’š “bad, evil” (NWSI I, 142), CA bi’sa “(how) bad”.

The possibility that the stem includes an ancient neg. \*bau- or bū- should not be dismissed.

**3.9.14** Proto-IE-HS stem [bag-] “to divide”

IE: Skt. bhaj- “to divide”, Av. bagəm “share”, Phryg. bag- “to deal out, present”, Toch. A pak, B. pāke “part”: PIE \*bhag-, \*bhagō-. IECD, 60; WP. II, 127; IEV, 247; IER, 5.

HS: CA baġġa “to cleave, cut, rip”; Egyp. bgn “knife”, bgs “dagger” (HED I, 226), etc. see derivatives below.

Some traditionally related words are:

3.9.14a IE: Ved. Bhagah “god”, Skt. bhaga- “gracious lord”, OPers. бага “god”, OCS bogû, Russ. bog id. IECD, 60; Buck, SS: §22.12; WP. II, 127; Meillet, Introd. 360.

HS: CA baġġa-tu, *a worshipped idol in pre-Islamic times*, and with r-/n-exts: CA baġaru was also “a god” worshipped by the tribes of Azdu in pre-Islam, Hatra bgn “prayer, invocation” (NWSI I. 144), Syr. baggen “to call to”, NHeb. hibgîn “to call for help” (DRS II, 43).

3.9.14b IE: Skt. bhajami “to enjoy, possess; good fortune”, OIr. su-baig-idid “he rejoices”, OCS. bogatû “rich”, Lith. bagatas id., Grk phagein “to eat”. SS: §§5.11, 11.51; WP. I, 732; IECD, 60.

HS: Egyp. *bg* “be splendid, to shine”, *wbg* “to shine” CA *baġġa* “be or become so fat from eating” also “become luxuriant (pasture)” (Albright, JAOS 47: 210, n. 17), *’inbaġġa*, CVII of *baġġa*, “to bulge out from so much *eating*”, Tna. *bāg bālā* “to shine, flare up”, Har. *bāgbāg bāya* “rise abruptly (fire), be dazzling (color)”, etc., Amh. *bāggā* “be good, successful”, Cush.: Ga. *bagā* “good” (DRS II, 42; HED, 40).

With infixed /-w-/: CA *bauwaġa* “to glitter, glisten, flash, and come to view”. As we should blindly expect, the verb also expresses “scream, speak loudly”. This word uncovers the primeval proot.

3.9.14c IE: OIr. *bagaim* “to boast, assert”.

HS: CA *baġaġa*, *ta-baġġaġa* “to boast, brag”: *baġbāġu* “talkative, arrogant”.

3.8.14d IE: Mlr. *bagh* “to battle, fight”, Lith. *boginti* “to struggle, tug”. ICED, 60.

HS: CA *baġġa* “to strike” also “thrust, stab”, Te. *bāggā* “thrust, push”, Housa *bug-* “hit, beat”.

3.9.14e IE: Lith. *bazmas* “mass, crowd”, Grk *pakhus* “bundle”, Arm. *bazum* “much, many”. IECD, 61.

HS: CA *baġmu* “multitude”.

CA and IE words are from [ba-] (see §2.13 above) and [gam-] “may, much, multitude” in CA *ġammu* id. (§3.3.16 above). One may note that the addition of proot [ba-] to stem [-gam] (also *mag*) changes /-g/ to /-z/ in Lith. and to /-kh/ in Grk. On the other hand, the addition of proot [ba-] to OIr. *bagaim* (fr. *ba-ga’-*) does cause any change.

### 3.9.15 Proto-IE-HS stem [bag-] “arm, shoulder, neck”

IE: Skt. *bhāhus* “arm”, Dor. *pākhus*, Toch. A *poke*, B *pauke* id., OHG. *buog* “shoulder (of animals)”, Oss. *bazug*, “shoulder”, OE. *bōg*, ON. *bōgr* “shoulder”: PIE *\*bhāġhu-*. IECD, 61; SS: §4.31; WP. II, 130; SOE: §218.

HS: Ga. *boku* “back of the neck”, Som. *bog* “flank” (Zaborski, 1975: 327).

### 3.9.16 Proto-IE-HS word [balag] “to shine”

IE: Grk *phlégō* “to shine, blaze”, Lat. *flagrāre* “to blaze, burn”; *fulgēre* “to flash”; *fulgore* “lightning”, Lith. *blizgėti* “to glitter, flash”, OCS. *blištati* “to shine”, Toch. *pālk-* “to burn”: PIE *\*bhleġ-*, *\*bhelġ-*, etc., considered by Indoeuropeanists as being from an ext. of PIE *\*bhel-*, seen in words having to do with ‘to shine’ as in Lith. *balts*, OCS *bêlû* “white”, Skt. *bhala-* “forehead”, Alb. *ballë* id., etc. The root is also seen, with *\*g-* or *\*sk-* ext. as in OE. *blican* “to glitter, sparkle”, ON. *blika* “to gleam”, OHG. *blic* “lightning”; OCS. *bliscanije* “lightning”, Cz. *blesk* id., etc. SS: §§1.55, 15.56; IECD, 80ff; WP. II, 211ff; DRLE, 19; IER, 6.

HS: CA *balaġa* “to shine, light”; CIV *baliġu*, *’a-blaġu* “white”; *bulġa-tu* “morning” (Al *’ayn* VI, 133; LA), Syr. *blaḡ* (*\*blag*) “to shine”, Heb. *hi-blīg* “to shine”, Cush.: Som. *belig* “to sparkle, flash” (DRS II, 66), Oromo *balag* “to shine” (HSED, n. 207).

Like IE, HS also has a stem [bal-] “to shine” as in CA *balā*, *bilā’u* “light of the sun”, Ug. *n-blw* “flame”. To this stem also belong, with various exts, Syr. *balbis* “to gleam, glitter”, Eth. *ta-balasa* “to glitter”, Amh. *beleč-ala* “to flash”, Ga. *balalesa* “to blaze”, CA *bulda-tu* “the space between the eyebrows”, *’i-bla(n)ḳ’a* “to appear, become clear”, *balāḳu* “a kind of stone that gives light”, etc.

### 3.9.17 Proto-IE-HS stem [bal-] “to speak”

IE: Lith. *biliti*, *bylot* “to speak, say”; *balsas* “sound”, Latv. *bilst* “to speak, say”, ORuss. *billīt* “to say, speak”, Toch. *pāl-* “to praise”, ON. *belja* “to bellow, roar”, Phryg. *ballēn* “king” as “speaker” in a popular assembly, OPruss. *billīt* “to say, speak”, ON. *belja* “to bellow, roar”, Toch. *pāl* “to praise”, Skt. *bhaṣ* (fr. *bhal-s*). SS: §18.21, WP. II, 182.

HS: CA *balata* “to speak succinctly”; *ballitu* “fluent and graceful in speech or discourse”, *ballaya* “to tell, inform”; Heb. *bela’* “slander, calumny” also “pronunciation” (DRS II, 69), Mand. *blṣ* “to pronounce, utter”, Syr. *belāṣā* “pronunciation” (MD, 66).

### 3.9.18 Proto-IE-HS stem [balbal-] “be confused”

IE: Lat. *balbūtīre* “stammer, twaddle”, Br. *balbuza* id., Lat. *bambaliō* with -m- for an earlier \*-l- or \*-b-, “stammerer”, Skt. *balbalah* “stammering”. IECD, 50f.

HS: CA *balbala* “to confuse (basically languages or dialects), throw into perplexity”; *ta-ballala*, said of languages, “be confused, mixed, and not understood”; *balbala-tu* “confusion, solicitude, perplexity”, *mu-ballalu* “growling, grumbling”, Heb. *bll* (*bilbēl*) “to mingle, confound”, esp. *languages* (OT, 136), Aram. *balbēl* “be troubled, confused”, Syr. *būlbālā* “confusion”, Soq. *blbl* “to bellow”, Te. *bālbā belā* “to jingle”, Amh. *bālbəlla* “small bell”. DRS II, 65.

### 3.9.19 Proto-IE-HS stem [balw] “calamity, misfortune”

IE: Goth. *balweins* “pain, suffering”, OE. *bealu* “calamity”, OHG. *balo* “ruin”, ON. *bol* “misfortune”, OCS. *bolēti* “be sick”; *bolēsni* “suffering”, Lith. *blukšti* “be weak”, Tock. *pāl*, *pīle* “wound”, Grk *phlauros* “bad”: PIE *\*bhal-*. SS: §16.31; IER, 7; WP. II, 189; IECD, 64;

HS: Assy. *balū* “go to ruin”; *uballi* “to destroy, bring to an end” (King, 1989: 338), CA *balā* “to inflict physical suffering upon”; *balawa-tu* fem. “calamity, suffering”; *bal’u* id.; CVIII *’ibtalā*, “be afflicted with calamity”, Aram. *belā* “be old, to perish”, Ug. *bly* “be worn out” (CA *bālī* id.), Ge. *balya*, Te. *bāla*, Tna. *bālāyā* “be worn out, old” (DRS II, 66), Ga. *bela* “dearth, famine”, Kab. *bla* “misfortune”.

### 3.9.20 Proto-IE-HS word [bald-] “blind”.

IE: Goth. *blinds* “blind”, OE., OHG. *blind* id.: OCS. *blesti* “astray”, *bleda* “error”, Latv. *blēdis* “deceiver”. IECD, 82f; SS: §4.97; IER, 6; WP. II, 216.

HS: Har., *bālla* “blind”, Z. *balla* id., Sid. *balli-čča*, Ga. *balla* “blind”; *balesa* “error, mistake”, Dar. *balla’a* “blind” (HED, 41), Cush.: Oromo *ballaa*, Sid. *ball*, Dar. *balla’a*, Bomb *balla’a* “blind” (HSED, n. 204).

CA *ballada*, with d-ext. as in IE, “be unable to see” as in PIP of Labīd:

«...wa ballada-ti 'al-'a'lamu billaili kal'akami» (LA); balāda-tu “stupidity, astray, confusion”: CA bulūlu “defect, fault”.

The reconstructed word is from ba- “not”; 'al “eye”, and -t- a suffix forming nouns; this is without the suffix = Egyp. b'l “blind”, Copt. belle id. (EHD I, 203). See §§2.13.10 & 2.21.5 above. It is almost evident that /-d/ is from an earlier /-t/ forming a subst.

#### Comments

As a ‘rule’, if a genuine term for ‘blind’ is not derived from “to shine, dazzle” or from “darkness, night”, then it is almost always a combination of ‘neg. + (a term for) eye’. Fresh shining examples are Lat. aquilus, akls and Lith. āklas.

#### 3.9.21 Proto-IE-HS stem [bul-] “leaf”

IE: Lat. folium “leaf”, Grk phúllon id., OIr. billeōc, Alb. bulë “bud”, OE. blæd id., OFris. bolla “peel”: PIE \*bhel-, \*bhul-, etc. IECD, 122, SS: §8.56; WP. II, 176.

HS: CA balla-tu “blossom, flower”: bulalu “seed”, Ga. bala “leaf, foliage”, Akk. bulālu “a plant”, Ge. 'ablalit “thistle”, Te. bəbəлта “a plant”, Amh. bəlbəlt id.

With m-ext.: CA balma-tu, 'a-blimu “leaf”, Syr. balmā “flax”: CA balima “to swell”, sp. *of the lips*: see below. DRS II, 68.

Some related words are:

CA balima “swell” with 'ablamu “(man) with fat or swollen lips” may be compared with Phryg. bambalun “penis”, from \*balbalon < \*bhalbhalon: Grk phállus, Lith. bambalos “fat man, boy”. Here also belong Lat. flēmen “swelling”, OBr. blin “pride”, etc.

In CA we also find bulbulun “boy”, Ug. blbl-m, pl., “member d'une certaine profession” (DRS II, 65), Har. balabāt “noble”, Amh. balabbat (HED, 41) = CA na-bīlu id. = Phryg. ballēn (§3.9.17 above).

#### 3.9.22 Proto-IE-HS word [bēld-] “blood”

IE: Goth. blōþ “blood”, OE. blōd, OHG. bluot id.

HS: Chad.: Gidar bēli “blood”, Mba fal id., Musgum fel id., Cush.: Saho biilo “blood”, Afar bil id., Xamir, Bil. bir, Xamta bera, Ga. bildima “blood, red” (HSED, n. 258; Carnochan, 1975: 462), With d-ext. as in Grm. Above: Ug. bld “a kind of wine” (DRS II, 66).

CA baladu, pl. 'a-blādu, “a mark left on the neck from a surface wound” as in Katami's poem:

«... wa fī ('a)n-nuhūri kulūmun dātu 'a-blādi» (LA).

#### 3.9.23 Proto-IE-HS stem [ban-] “to perish”

IE: Goth. banja “wound, sore, blow”, OE, ON ben “wound”; OE. bana “murderer”, OHG. bano “death”, ON. bani id., OIr. banaim “to kill”, Av. ban- “be sick”, SS: §4.85; WP. II, 149.

HS: Egyp. wbn “wound, sore, blow”: bn “to pass away, be dissolved”, CA wa-banu “harm, hunger”, Ga. bona “dry season”.

**3.9.24** Proto-IE-HS word [band-] “to bind”, proot [nau-] in CA nī-ṭa pass. “be connected with, joined to”, nau-ḏu “joint”, Egyp. nw “to bind, tie” > nd id. See §2.13.5 above.

IE: Skat. bandh- “to bind”, Av. band- id., Goth., OE. bindan “to bind”, OHG. bintan id.: Lat. of-fend-ix “band, knot”: PIE \*bhendh-. SOE: §218; WP. II. 152; IECD, 72; SS: §9.16; IEV, 248; IER, 7.

HS: Egyp. bnd “to bind, tie”: OSA bīnaṭu “weaver” (reported by LA), CA bandu, subs., used in the game of chess “tied, bound” > MSA *band* “article” (only in the constitution or in law). ‘*Band*’ here implies “tied together” in reference to the provisions, sections, etc. of a given ‘*article*’. SL and others dialects bannada “to tie with a lace (shoes)”. In SL, too, bandak means “plants (of crops, etc.) amassed and tied together in order to carry them to the threshing floor”, a cpd of many elements compressed together.

Another surface form based on [nau-] is seen in Egyp. nd(d) “to bind”, CA nauḏu above, Lat. nōdus “knot”, Goth. nati “net”, etc. SS: §9.16.

**3.9.25** Proto-IE-HS stem [bar-] “to boil”, common with redupl. [barbar-] in HS, but in most IE. languages the second \*-b- becomes /w/. It can be said that IE languages preserved intact the oldest form of the proot before infixing /-r-/. This implies that the primeval proot was [baW-]. As you reach this level of analysis, you will certainly find that /b/ and /p/ are no more than allophones of a primeval phoneme, thus [baw-] = [paW-]: see §2.3.13, n. 2 above. This also true for all similar pairs of consonants distinguished by ‘voice’.

IE: Lat. fervere “to boil”, Ir. berbaim “I boil”, W. berwi, Br. birvi “to boil”: Skt. burvani- “wild, restless”, OHG. briuwan, OE. breowan, OSax. breuwan “brew”. SS: §10.39; CCG: §19; WP. II, 167, IECD, 75, EM, 352f; IER, 9; DRLE, 20.

HS: Egyp. b’rb’r “to boil”, Copt. berber id (EHD I, 204), CA barbara “to speak with anger; wild”, Soq. brbr “to bellow” (DRS II, 81), Ga. birbir “restless”, Har. birbir “fluttering” (HED, 44).

**3.9.26** Proto-IE-HS word [barag-] “high”, from an ext. of a root \**bar-*, seen in words for “top, tip, high” as in IE: OIr. barr “top”, OW. bar, Br. barr id., OHG. parrēn “to stand up stiff”; HS: Akk. bertu “high”, Egyp. brbr “stone with a pyramid top, pyramid”, Som. bur “hill” (Kirk, 1905: 209), CA ’a-barra “rank first, be the leader”, lit. “be the highest of all”; ma-barrā-tu “name of a hill”

IE: Hitt. parkuš “high”, Skt. brhant id., Arm. barjr id., Oss. barz “mound”, OHG. berg, OE. beorg “mountain”, ON. borg “fortress”, Lat. frons “famous”, OIr. brianda “famous”, OBr. brientin “noble”, Toch. pärkär “long”. HCG; §86; WP. II. 172f; IECD, 74, 113, IER, 7f.

HS: CA bariḡu “high”: baraḡa “be high, prominent”; burḡu “castle, fortress” also “planet, star”, Syr. burgā “tower”, Te. bārgäšä “to excel” (DRS II, 81).

Words below are derivatives of [barg-].

3.9.26a IE: Grk brégma “front part of the head”, OE. brægen “brain”.

HS: CA baraĝu “eyebrows” also “greatness of the eye”, Egyp. br “eye” (EHD I, 219).

Also belong here OIr. abra “eye-lid”, OCor. abrans, W. amrant, Br. abrant id. CCG: §49.

**3.9.27** Proto-IE-HS word [barag-] “to shine” appears as if it were fr. an ext. of a stem [bar-] as in Akk. barāru “to sparkle; pure”, Ug. br “to shine; pure”, Aram.: Jp. barār “render clear”, Heb. bar, CA barru “pure”, Ga. bariya “to dawn”; barye “dawn”, etc. below.

Frankly speaking, it is impossible to investigate scientifically any IE-HS root without taking into account its stages of developments across millennia. The absolute truth is that any word (barag- above, band- “bind”, and so forth) has lost in the course of time much more phonological elements and/or proots than it has retained. What has come down to us is its most refined and polished form.

IE: Skt. bhrāje “to shine”, Av. brāz- id., OE. beorht “bright”, Goth. bairhts “shining”, Hitt. parkuiš “pure”, Pal. parkuiti “cleans, purifies”, Toch. pārkānt “sunrise”, Lith. brėkšti “to dawn”; brekšta “dawn”, OCS. brězgu “dawn”, etc. see related words below. IECD, 73, 101; SS: §15.56; HCG: §86; WP. II, 123f, 170; IEV, 249; IER, 7f.

HS: Egyp. b’rg’ “to illumine, give light” (EHD I, 204), CA barraĝa “to show one’s beauty (i.e. *make oneself shine*)”; bāriĝu “beautiful, handsome”, Amh. boräg “to color”, Sab. brg “acquire, possess” (SD, 31).

The following are some related words:

3.9.27a IE: Skt. bhraçate “to shine, glitter”, Goth. and OE words above for “bright”.

HS: Akk. barāku “to flash”, CA baraça, etc. (DRS II, 86), Ga. baraça “daylight”; also with ‘-ext.: CA barça’u “white”, Egyp. bwrḫ’ “to shine, lighten, sparkle” (EHD I, 215).

3.9.27b IE: W. bore “morning”, Br. beure id., OIr. imbārach “tomorrow”? (See CA word below).

HS: Cush.: Som., Ga. barrito “morning”, Saho, Afar beeraa id., Oromo barri “dawn”, Chad.: Ndm buri “morning”, Mubi burburu id., etc. (HSED, n. 223). Also Som. berri “tomorrow”, Ga. boru id., CA ’al-bāriḥa-tu “yesterday” from barāḥu “the sun” > Ar. dialects imbāriḥ id., where /l/ becomes /m/ before /-b/ = OIr. word above for ‘*tomorrow*’.

3.9.27c IE: Skt. bhūrjas “birch”, Lith. bėržas id., OE. beorc, ON. bjork, OHG. birihha id., Russ. bereza, Bulg. breza id.: PIE \*bherēǵ-, bherǵ-, etc. IECD, 73, 101; SS: §8.63; WP. II, 170; IER, 7; SOE: §218.

Lehmann (PIEP: §6.2) finds in Skt. and Lith. words evidence for a laryngeal and he reconstructs IE \*bherX- ǵ-.

The long vowels before /r/ in Skt. and Lith. forms may be a reflex of laryngeal or a semivowel. HS evidence below suggests that the lost sound was a semivowel either /-w- / or /-y-/. As a rule admitting no exceptions, a semivowel could be pronounced in *medial*



or *final* position as a long vowel, depending on the part of speech of the derivative and on its grammatical function.

HS: Akk. *burāšu* “pine, cypress”, Aram. *brt* id., (DRS II, 88), Heb. *berōš* “pine, cypress”, orig. “pine” (OT, 157), CA *barθu* “fine white land (earth) in which trees grow”, Har. *barāsa* “a kind of white earth”: PHS word *\*burāθ-* “pine”. (Grk *βράθου* ?).

HS derives from [bar-] another word for “a tree”: PHS *\*bur-ʿ-* “a bright tree”, prob. orig. “birch”: Egyp. *bʿrī* “cypress wood”: CA *burʿumu* “bud, branch” also “splendid, beautiful”, Te., Tna. *bārʿad* “white, brilliant” (DRS II, 86).

It may be interesting to note that IE-HS [bar-] “to shine” provides IE-HS languages with many words for ‘*colors*’ and for ‘*animals*’. Examples are:

3.9.27d IE: Lat. *burrus* “red”, *burricus* “small horse”.

HS: CA *burāku* “horse”; *burka-tu* “kind of white earth with red and black stone, white and black”;

3.9.27e IE: OPruss. *braydis* “deer”, Lith. *briedis* id.

HS: CA *ʿa-bārīdu*, pl., “tiger”, Heb. *bardlās* id.: Heb., CA *brd* “colored, spotted”, Har., Amh., Ga. *burre* “spotted”. Also CA, Aram. *brd* “a kind of horse”, CA *birḏaunu* “mule, beast of burden”, Syr. *bardānā* id.

3.9.27f IE: OCS. *bronŭ* “white”, OE. *brūn* “brown”, etc.

HS: CA *barniy* “yellow dates or red-yellow”, and with regressive assimilation: *bunniy* (from *\*burniy*) “brown”, Som. *bora* “yellow”, Ga. *bora* “yellow, grey”, Amh. *bora*, Har. *bōra* “brown, cream-colored”, etc.

### 3.9.28 Proto-IE-HS word [barm-] “to turn, revolve”

IE: Skt. *bhram-* “to revolve, wander”.

HS: Assy. *barāmu* “to weave colored threads” (King, 1898: 340), CA *barama* “to turn, revolve, twist”. In SL *baram* = “revolve, wander, turn, twist”.

**3.9.29** Proto-IE-HS word [barīm-] “cloth”, a deriv. of the root [barm-] above; the development may be depicted as follows: “to revolve, turn” > “to weave” (cf. Akk. *barāmu* also means “to weave”, CA *barama* also means “to spin, fix”) > “thread” (see below) > “cord, rope” > “cloth, garment”.

IE: Grk *pharos* “cloak, mantle”; *phormos* “a seaman’s cloak”, Lith. *burva* “piece of clothing”, *burē* “sail”, Latv. *bura* id.

HS: Akk. *birmu* “brightly colored cloth” (DRS I, 85), Heb. *barōmīm* “damask clothes, variegated stuffs in which threads of various colors are woven together in figures” (OT, 156-157), CA *barīmu* “a kind of garment” also “rope or girdle with two colors wrapped round women’s breasts”; *mu-bramu* (of clothes) “with two ply yarn”.

**3.9.30** Proto-IE-HS word [burm-] “container; measure”, fr. [barm] “to weave, spin, fix” above.

IE: Grk phormós “basket, corn-measure”, Alb. barrë “load”, Goth. barm, OHG., OS. barm “lap”, ON. barmtog “haule-rope”. IECD, 94.

HS: CA burma-tu “pot, casserole”, Talm. būrmā “big jug or pitcher”, Syr. būrmā “(cooking) pot”, Sar. brm “a measure of weight”. DRS II, 85.

For the Alb. word, CA barimu adj. “annoyed”; mu-bramu subs. “burden(ed)” (LA).

Some related words are:<sup>307</sup>

3.9.30a IE: Germ. barm, barmen “crowd, pack”.

HS: CA barīmu “entire (people), herd (of small cattle)”.

3.9.30b IE: ON. barmr “brim.

HS: CA barma-tu “peak”.

3.8.30c IE: Grk phormís “faggot”.

HS: CA burumu, pl., “man with no morals”.

**3.9.31** Proto-IE-HS stem [bar-], with various exts, esp. /-k/, “chest, belly, breast”, fr. an ext. of [bar-] “to swell” as in Assy. barū “be sated, abound with, superabundant” (King, 1898: 340), Heb. bārī “fatted, fat” (OT, 158), CA burāya-tu “fleshy and fat” (beast of burden), Som. barur “fat”.

IE: OIr. bruine “front of chest”; W. bron id., Goth. and common Germ. brusts, pl. “breast” (both “front of chest” and “woman’s breast”), Russ. brjucho “belly”, Pol. brzuch, Cz. brich id.: OIr. brū “belly, womb”, W. bru “womb”, etc., all are derivatives of notion of ‘swelling’. SS: §4.46; IECD, 102f; WP. II, 197ff; IER, 9.

HS: Som. ber-ki “liver” (Kirk, 1905: 210). With k-ext.: Akk. birku “breast”, Soq. berak “chest, breast”, Eth. burke “shoulder” (DRS II, 84), CA barku, birka-tu “front of the chest”. An important question arises here: *is Sem. /-k/ linguistically identical with Som. /-ki/*?

**3.9.32** Proto-IE-HS stem [bar-] “to strike, fight” has already been dealt with in §3.5.1 above.

IE: Skt. bhara- “to fight, battle”, Lat. ferīre “to strike, beat”, OCS. brati “to fight”, OE. berian “to strike, beat”, ON. berjā id., Alb. bjer, imper., “strike!”, PIE \*bher-, \*bhor- etc. SS: §§20.11, 9.21; WP. II, 160; IECD, 74; DRLE, 21.

HS: CA barra “to defeat, overcome, be victorious”; ’a-barra “to subdue”, Sab. brr “to come into the open to fight” (SD, 31), Egyp. brr “be or become hard” (EHD I, 219), with ’-ext.: Talm. berā “be strong”, etc. (DRS II, 80), with θ-ext.: Sab. brθ “military campaign, battle”.

**3.9.33** Proto-IE-HS word [bar’- or baray-] “to bear”

IE: Grk phérō “to bring forth, carry”, Lat. ferō “I bear”, Skt. bharami id., OPers. bar- “to bear”, Toch. pār- id., Phryg. abber “to carry, bring”, Arm. berem “I bring, carry”,

---

<sup>307</sup> For IE words, see IECD, *ibid.*

Goth. *ga-bairan*, OE *beran*, OHG. *beran* “to bear”: PIE *\*bher-*, i.e. *\*bherX-*. IECED, 74, 100; SS: §§4.72, 2.27; SOE: §218; WP. II, 154, 193; Meillet, *Introd.* 63; IEV, 248; IER, 7; SL, 10; DRLE, 20f.

HS: Heb. *bārā* “to create, produce” also “beget, bring forth” (OT, 155), Aram. *berā*, Mand. *bra*, Syr. *br* “to create; son”, etc., Soq. *bere*, Meh. *bīrū*, Shh. *buri* “to give birth to”. DRS II, 80; MD, 68-69; NWSI I, 188ff, CA *bara’a* “create (usu. God), to bring forth”, Sab. *br* “to create” (SD, 30),

An important derivative of this word is [bar-], whose original sense is “human being, offspring”. This meaning has been preserved in HS: cf. Heb. *barū* “human being”, CA *bariyya-tu* (from *bari*’-yatu, according to LA, r. *br*’), pl., “human being”, Sab. *brw* (*\*br*’) “offspring, child, son”, Soq. *mi-brhe* “child” with *berhe* “father”, *boreh* “mother”, Shh. *em-bera* “child”, etc. §2.17.60 above.

In IE the derivative *\*bar-* has undergone two changes:

(1) a morphological change by adopting a suffix *-ter* (the same suffix is seen in words denoting family relationships (like ‘*mother*’ and ‘*sister*’),

(2) a semantic change by narrowing the range of its application; from “*human being*” in general to a particular “human being”, i.e. “*brother*”: cf. Skt. *bhrātar* “brother”, OCS. *bratū* id., etc. In this case, the morphological change has led to semantic change. If this morphological change had not occurred in IE, the meaning of Skt. *\*bhra-*, etc. would have been “offspring or human being”. Evidence from IE languages in which both *\*bhar-* and *\*bhrater-* have survived supports this fact: cf. Goth. *barn* “child” besides *brōþar* “brother”, Lith. *bernas* “son” besides *brotis* “brother”, ON. *barn* “child” besides *brōþir*. Alb. too has *bir* “son”. From this root also comes Skt. *bhrūnah* “boy”, Pers. *burnā* id., ON. *burr* “son”, etc. *all of them are doublets*.

#### *Comments*

The word for ‘brother’ in IE is the same as Sumerian *barta* id. It is most likely that this is the same /-t/ seen in CA and pronounced /-ti/ or /-ta-/: see §2.9, under Comments, n. c above.

#### **3.9.34** Proto-IE-HS stem [barh-] “injure”

IE: Skt. *bhrī-* “to punish, hurt, injure”, Av. *brī-* “to cut”, Alb. *brei* “to gnaw, wear away”, Phryg. *bri-* prob. “to punish”, OIr. *brissim* “to break”, Br. *bresa* “to rumple”, W. *briw* “wound”, OHG. *brestan* “to burst”, OCS. *briti* “to shear”, Lat. *friō* “to shave”. IECED, 103; SS: §9.26; IEV, 250; CCG, §25.5; WP. II, 194, 206; IER, 9.

HS: CA *barraḥa* “to torture, harm”; *baraḥu* “torture, evil”, Ug. *brḥ* “evil, harm”, Heb. *bārīḥ* id., etc. (DRS: II, 83).

Egy. *bnḥ* (*\*brḥ*) “to cut” and Berb.: Shil. *bri* “to wound, rub” (Applegate, 1958: 50) may belong to [baray-] below.

#### **3.9.35** Proto-IE-HS word [baray-] “to cut”.

IE: OE. *brēotian* “to break”, OHG. *brōdi* “fragile”, ON. *brjōto* “to break”, *broma* “fragment”: OE. *bryttian* “to divide”, Grk *phroudos* “decrepit, decayed”: PIE *\*bhreu-*. SS: §9.26; IECED, 102.

HS: CA baraya, barā “to sharpen, cut, hew”, Heb. br’ “to cut, cut out, carve”, brh “to cut, cut asunder” (OT, 155, 156), Lih. bara’ “to carve”, Pun. br’ “engraver”, (DRS II, 82), Sab. bry “to destroy” (SD, 32), Ga. burusa “hammer”.

Also belong here Skt. bhardhaka- “cutting off, shearing”, Lat. forfex “scissors”; CA bartaka-tu “cutting off”, bardaḥa “to file”: Ug. brd “to cut”, CA barada “to hew, carve”; (with t-ext.) CA baratu “ax”, Sab. brt id., etc.

### 3.9.36 Proto-IE-HS stem [bar-] “to bore, pierce”, fr. an ext. of [bar-].

IE: Lat. forāre “to bore, pierce”, OE. borian “to bore”, OHG. boran id.; bora, OE. bor “auger”, ON. bora id., Grk pharō “to plow”. IECD, 125; SS: §§9.46-9.47.

HS: Ge. barara “to pierce”, Sab. brr id. (DRS II, 87), Heb. bārar “to separate, sever out” (OT, 263), Som. burburi “to crush, destroy”, with z-ext.: Heb. baraz “to pierce”; bərzā’ “a hole, wound made by piercing”, BARAM., Talm. brz “to pierce” (OT, 157), with m-ext: CA barama “to bore”; mi-bramu “auger” with buryi “screw-nail”.

3.9.37 Proto-IE-HS word [burd-] “garment, cloak”, fr. an ext. of [bar-] “to weave” (see §3.8.28 above) or, less likely, from [bar-] “to shine” (see §§3.8.27d-3.8.27f). It is most likely that final /-d/ is from an earlier interdental or /-t/, forming a subst.

IE: Grk bâros “cloak”, W. brethyn “cloth”, OIr., Ir. brat, Br. broz “woman’s clothes”. SS: §6.21; CCG: §73.4.

HS: CA burda-tu “a speckled outer garment”, OSA ’abradu “black and white garment”, Heb. \*bārōd “spotted, speckled” (OT, 156), Syr. bārdā “dark (in color) garment”, NSyr. birdā “spotted, speckled” (DRS II, 81), with ‘-ext.: CA burdu’ah “saddle”, Jp. marda’tā “saddle, rug (of cloth)”, Syr. barda’tā “rug”.

3.9.38 Proto-IE-HS word [barh-] “to think, prove”, from an ext. of \*bar, seen in words for “prove, test, think” as in Heb. brr “to examine, prove, search out” (OT, 163), Ga. berra “to study”.

IE: Grk phronéō “to think”; phrontís “thought”.

HS: Akk. barū “to look at, inspect” (AG, 69), Assy. barū “to see, gaze upon” (King, 1898: 339), CA barha-na, ’a-braha “to prove; proof, evidence”, barhama “to gaze upon, contemplate”, Sab. brh(n) “evidence, proof, testimony” (SD, 31), Ge. barha “to shine”, Te. bārha id., Amh. bərhan “light” (DRS II, 82).

For the ultimate origin of the word, see §2.17.58 above.

### 3.9.39 Proto-IE-HS stem [bur-] “grain”

IE: Lat. far, farīna “grain, spelt”, Osc. far “food”, OCS. bûrû “barley”, Goth. barizeins “made of barley”, ON. barr “barley”, OE. bere id., Latv. bariba “food”, Ir. bairin “cake, loaf”, etc. Meillet, *Introd.* 135; SS: §8.44; IER, 5; WP. II, 134.

HS: Egyp. b’rb’r “grain” (EHD I, 204), CA burru id.; baṛīru “a kind of food”, Akk. burru “cereal”, Heb. bar “grain”, Soq. bor, Meh. bar “grain”, Som. bur “wheat” (DRS II, 87), Sab. brr “wheat” (SD, 31).

Our reconstruction of IE-HS words strengthens the view that ‘voice’ was allophonic in early Proto-IE-HS, and that allophones have subsequently and gradually achieved ‘phonemic status’ at later stages, a linguistic phenomenon I have already brought to light, placed so much emphasis on, and kept on illustrating it in Chapter II whenever occasions permit. But, see §2.3.10 above.

If we take /b/ and /p/ as an illustration, we will find that the absence of contrast between them is quite evident in many pairs of surface words (or roots) such as [bur] above and [pur] (§3.8.33) “grain”, [bar] (§3.9.33) and [par] (§3.8.21) “to bear”, etc.

Due to phonetic and semantic changes operating in both families over millennia, the survived pair of words might have come to be differentiated from each other in *one* or *more* of the following *five* broad areas:

(a) *productivity*, i.e. *one is more productive than the other as far as derivation is concerned*,

(b) *use*, i.e. *one is more widely used than the other*,

(c) *meaning*, i.e. *one expresses a slightly different shade of the meaning expressed by the other*. For example, compare and reconsider words for “to be” given above in §3.8.51 and §3.9.4.

(d) *one or both may acquire different exts*,

(e) *one or both may change the original part of speech*.

In a few cases, one family has kept the pair of words, while the other retained one of the variants. For example, [ban-] “to perish” is found in both IE and HS: see §3.10.23 above. However, HS has also kept [pan-] as in CA fanā. Also see IE-HS words in §3.8.30 & HS words in §2.13.24 above.

*My final word on this issue is as follows: ‘voice’ had continued to be allophonic in Proto-World language until the time when native Australlians crossed from Asian to Australlia ‘on foot’ and settled permanently there.*

The phenomenon just sketched above can be tackled by *professional scholars only* after all proots have been ascertained.

**3.9.40** Proto-IE-HS reduplicated form [barbar] “make noises, talk”, deriv. fr. [bar-] “to boil”.

IE: Arm. barbarem “to talk”, Blg. brâbriv “talkative”, Hind. bhaṛbhaṛ “to cackle”. IECD, 76.

HS: CA barbara “be talkative, speak with anger, bellow”; barbara-tu “talkativeness, din, tumult”, Soq. brbr “to bellow”, NSyr. berbir “to roar”. DRS II, 81.

**3.9.41** Proto-IE-HS stem [rib-] “piece of cloth, rope”

IE: OE. rap “rope”, Goth. -raip in skauda-raip “shoe-lace”, ON. reip id.; ript “piece of cloth”.

HS: CA ribaba-tu fem. “piece of cloth” also “thread”, with ʔ-ext.: ribaʔtu “rope”: rabaʔa “to tie”, Heb. \*rābad “to bind”, whence rābīd “collar” (OT, 958), Egyp. rwd (\*rbʔ) “cord, string, bandlet” (EHD I, 421).

**3.9.42** Proto-IE-HS word [‘abr-] “be powerful, strong”, fr. an ext. of a stem [‘ab-] in Egyp. ‘b “strength”, CA ‘ubbiy “valor, bravery”.

IE: Goth. abrs “strong”; abraba “very”; bi-abrjan “be astonished”, ON. afr “powerful”, Mlr. abr-, W. afr- id., Cz. obr “giant”, etc. IECD, 1; SS: §4.81; WP. I, 177f.

HS: Akk. abāru “to be strong” (MD, 5); ēberu “to pass over” (AG, 72), CA ‘abara id., Heb. ‘br “to pass over, to assail” (OT, 743f), “to cross over”; ‘ibāru “strong (camel)”, Sab. ‘br “to cross over” also “to protect” (SD, 11), Ug. \*‘br “to cross over” whence m‘br “crossing point” (UG: 532) = CA ma‘baru id.

For Goth. abraba, CA ‘ubru “much, many”, and for Goth. bi-abrjan, CA CVIII ‘i‘tabara “to wonder”.

**3.9.43** Proto-IE-HS stem [nab-] “sky, cloud”

IE: Hitt. nepis “sky”, OCS. nebo, nebese “sky”, Skt. nabhas- “cloud, mist”, Grk nephélē id., Lat. nebula “cloud”, OIr. nel, nell id., W. nifwl “fog”, OHG. nebul, OSax. nebal “cloud”: PIE \*nebh-. IECD, 830; Meillet, Introd. 63; HCG: §87; SL, 68; SS: §1.73; WP. I, 131; DRLE, 133; IER, 64.

It seems that IE-HS [nab-] was first used to refer to “a deity”, believed to reside somewhere in the ‘sky’: cf. Egyp. nb “lord, master”. From this early sense, notions such as “sky”, “heaven”, “cloud”, and many others related ideas have developed. To this stem also belong Egyp. Nbt “a cloud fiend”, Nebes “name of a god”, nbd-t “a kind of cloud”, OArām. nb’ “Nebo = deity”, CA nabiy “prophet”, etc. see §2.11.62 above.

The stem above is a cpd of at least two easily recognized proots: [nau-] and [-b-]: see *Comments* of §3.10.16 below.

**3.9.44** Proto-IE-HS word [ḥubl-/r-] “navel”, from an ext. of a root \*ḥub-, seen in Egyp. ḥp’ “navel string”. The original meaning of the root is probably identical with that of Lat. umbō “boss”, CA ḥubra-tu id.

IE: Grk omphalós “navel”, Lat. umbilīcus id., Skt. nabhi- id., OPruss. nabis, OIr. imbliu, OE. nafola, OHG. nafolaid id.: PIE \*ombh-, etc. SS: §4.43; WP. I, 130; SOE: §228.

HS: Ge. ḥəmbərt “navel”, Tna. ḥəmbərti, Te. həmbər “navel”, Har. ḥəmbūrṭi “navel, middle part”, Amh., Arg. əmbərt, Gaf. gumbərə “navel”, Cush.: Qua., gumbera, Dem. gumbra id. (HED, 83), Egyp. ḥlpí (EHD I, 533), by metathesis and devoicing of \*b (ḥbl), “navel”.

**3.9.45** Proto-IE-HS word [ḥabl-] “bad, evil”, an ext. of \*ḥab-, seen in Egyp. ḥb “to deceive, fraud”, CA ḥabba (§2.16.4 above).

IE: Goth. ubils “bad, evil”, OE. yfel, OHG. ubil id.

HS: CA ḥabīlu “bad, evil”; ḥabula “be insane, mad, evil”; ḥabilu “satan; corrupt”, Heb. ḥbl “to act corruptly, be perverse, corrupt”, Syr., BAram. ḥbl “to act corruptly”, Eth. ḥbl “to act corruptly, viciously” (OT, 291).

**3.9.46** Proto-IE-HS word [ḥabir-] “to rejoice; get drunk” as a n. [ḥubur-]

IE: OLat. *ēber* “drunk”, Lat. *ēbrius* id., Arm. *arbeal* “get drunk”, MHG. *āber* “mild weather”. IECD, 229f.; IEV, 45.

HS: Egyp. *ḥb-t* “a kind of drink offering, beer”: *ḥb* “feast, festival, rejoicing” (EHD I, 474), CA *ḥabbaba* “to drink to the full”; *ḥabba* “to love”, with r-ext. as in IE: CA *ḥuburu* “pleasure, rejoicing”, Sab. *ḥbr* “sorcery” (SD, 65).

### 3.9.47 Proto-IE-HS word [kūb-, i.e. kwp] “cup”

IE: Grk *kúmbos* “vessel, hollow”; *kúmbē* “pot, cup, helmet”, Skt. *kumbhas* id., Av. *xumbō*, Arm. *kumb* “hump”, Gaul. *cumba* “valley”: PIE *\*kumbhos-*. IECD, 587; WP. I, 375. IE *\*-m-* is from an earlier *\*-W-*. In practice, Indoeuropeanists confine their work to the surface form and pay no attention to the deep structure underlying it.

HS: Egyp. *k’bw* “a measure for liquid” (EHD II, 786), CA *kūbu* “pot, cup” also “a measure”, Syr. *kūba* “pot”, Mand. *kuba* “cup, drinking bowl” (MD, 205), Soq. *kwp* “pot”.

Sturtevant derives IE words above from IH *\*kəHubh-*. A root similar to that of IH is seen in HS, but with initial uvular /q/ instead of velar /k/: *\*qūb-* as in Egyp. *q’b* “pot, vessel” (EHD II, 763), CA *qa’bu* (fr. *\*qū’bu* because nearly all words for “cup, vessel, and the like” have a root vowel /u/ not /a/: (cf. *γumru*, *’ussu*, *kūzu*, *qubbā’u*, *ḥuqqa-tu*, *ḥulla-tu*, etc.); *mu-qa’abu* “hollow, vaulted”; *qa’bu* “depth”. The same root also appears with metathesis in Heb. *kōba’* “helmet” (OT, 450), Ug. *qb’t* “cup” (UG, 536), and even in CA *qubba’a-tu* “cup”.

For the ult. orig. of IE-HS words above, see §2.17.83.18 above.

### 3.9.48 Proto-IE-HS stem [’ab-] “opposite, against”

IE: Skt. *abhi* “against, near, for, without, toward”, Hitt. *apiya* “there, then”, Av. *aiwi* “toward, near, for”, OPers. *abiy* id., Lat. *ob* “opposite, before, at, to, for, owing to”, OCS *obū* “beyond”: PIE *\*obh(i)-* “against, athwart, at”. WP. I, 124; IECD, 861.

HS: Egyp. *’b* “opposite” as in *m’b* “opposite, facing, together with” (*m* = in, with, in the manner of”) as a vb *’ab* “to contradict, to face someone or something”, caus. *y’b* “to come toward”.

### 3.9.49 Proto-IE-HS word [’arab-] “to know, think”

IE: Lat. *arbitrārī* “to think”.

HS: CA *’araba*, *’a-’raba* “to express, analyze, point out”, Som, Ga. *arrab* “tongue”, Sab. *γrb* “to know, recognize”, with interchange between /b/ and /p/ in final position: CA *’arafa* “to know”, Syr. *’rp* “to know”, etc.

### 3.9.50 Proto-IE-HS word [šarib-] “to drink”

IE: Lat. *sorbēre* “to suck in”.

HS: Ug. *šrb* “to drink” (UG: 532), CA. *šariba* id., Eth. *šaraba* id. (Rabin, 1975: 87, n. 19).

### 3.9.51 Proto-IE-HS word [buṭm/n-] “terebinth”

IE: Lat. *betula* “birch”, Ir. *bethe*, W. *bedwen*, Br. *bezven* id.

HS: Akk. buṭnu, CA buṭnu, buṭmu “terebinth”.

**3.9.52** Proto-IE-HS word [bud-n-] “fatness, swelling”

IE: ON. pott “pot”, OE. pott id., etc. Buck (SS: §5.26) derives the Germc. words from a PIE root \*budno- “fatness, swelling” = CA budnu id., Som. badan “many” (Kirk, 1905: 211).

**3.9.53** Proto-IE-HS stem [ban-] “tip, peak”

IE: OIr. benn “peak, horn”, W. ban “peak”, Br. bann “wing”, MLG. pint “penis”. CCG: §46

HS: Egyp. bnbn-t “the top of a pyramid”, connected by Albright (JAOS, 47, p. 215, n. 31) with CA banānu “extremities of the fingers”, Akk. benn- “the eldest of a family” (DRS II, 72), Ga. banti “roof”.

**3.9.54** Proto-IE-HS stem [buk-] “fireplace”

IE: Lat. focus “fireplace”, Arm. boč “flame”.

HS: Egyp. bk “to illumine, shine” (EHD I, 225), Ga. bakaka “lightning”.

**3.9.55** Proto-IE-HS word [šabʼat-] “seven”

IE: Skt. sapta, Grk ἑπτα, Lat. septem id. Earlier /-b-/ was assimilated to the immediately following /-t-/ in IE and became /-p-/. This was due to the loss of /-ʼa-/: comp. CA sabʼatu id., Phoen., Moab., OAram. šbʼ-*t* id.



### 3.10 *PROTO-IE-HS* /š ~ s/

Proto-IE-HS /š/ (a voiceless palatal fricative) ~ /s/ (a voiceless dental fricative) are in PIE /s/ and in PHS /š/ or /s/.

#### 3.10.1 Proto-IE-HS word [šalm-] “safety, peace; sound, safe, well”

IE: Umb. saluom “salvum”, Lat. salus “welfare, safety” also “health”; salvas “sound, safe, well”, Goth. sēls “good”, Skt. sarvah “whole”, Grk hólos “entirety, whole”, Toch. A salu “entirety”, B solme “wholly”. SS: §§11.25, 11.32; IECD, 1243f.

HS: Akk. šulmu “welfare, health” (AG, 106), Assyr. šulmu “safety, peace, prosperity”; šalimtu “entirely”; šalmaš “safe and sound” (King, 1898: 391), CA salāmu “peace, safety, security”; sālimu “sound, well, sane, unhurt”, OAram. šlm “well-being” (AG, 14), Phoen. šlm “be complete” (AG, 150), Egyp. šyrm “peace, content”.

#### 3.10.2 Proto-IE-HS word [šallam-] “to hand over, deliver”

IE: OE. sellan “to hand over, sell, offer, give”, ON. selja “to hand over, sell”, OHG. sellen “to hand over, give up”, Goth. saljan “to offer”, OCS. pra-soliti “to sell”, Latv. solu “bid”. IECD, 1243; SS: §11.82.

HS: CA sallama “to hand over, deliver”; Ug. šlm “to deliver” (UG, 532), OAram. šlm “to pay back” (AG, 14), Phoen. šlm “to pay, requite” (AG, 150).

For OHG. sellen “give up”, CA CX ’istaslama “to give up, surrender”.

For notion of “sell”, Akk. šalmu “price, value”; šulmanu “full payment” (AG, 102), CA sil’a-tun, with ‘-ext.: “merchandise”, Sab. sl’ “tribute” as verb “to hand over” (SD, 138), EHeb. sl’, Palm., JAram. sl’, Nab. sl’n “certain coin” (NWSI II, 788).

#### *Comments*

We have thus far witnessed a linguistic phenomenon of great magnitude; this is the doubling of the medial consonant (see §3.4.9 above). Traces of this IE-HS grammatical feature are found in all IE languages, but the signification previously attached to ‘*double consonant*’ seems to have been lost in IE languages.

#### 3.10.3 Proto-IE-HS stem [šal-] “to steal”. In IE. a proot [-t-] is an infix = CA CVIII ’i-stalla: see §2.8.19 above.

IE: Goth. stilan “to steal”, OE., OHG. stelan, ON. stela id.

HS: Akk. šalālu “to plunder”; šallatu “plunder, booty” (AG, 101-102), Sab. sll “to plunder” (SD, 138), CA CII ’a-salla “to steal”; ’i-slālu “stealing, theft”; CVIII ’i-stalla > satala.

#### 3.10.4 Proto-IE-HS stem [šam-] “same, similar, equal”

IE: Lat. similis “similar”, OIr. samail, Br. hafal id. Skt. samas “same, like, equal”; samānas “similar”, Ved. sam “every, any”, Toch. sam “equal”, Grk smós “same”, Goth. sama id.; samana “together”, IECD, 1142ff; WP. II, 488; Meillet, Introd. 126f; SOE: §231.

HS: Egyp. sm, smy “to resemble”; sm-t “likeness”, Akk. šimtu “mark, mark of distinction”, CA sima-tu id.; samā-watu “self, same”.

**3.10.5** Proto-IE-HS stem [šam-] “field”, related to [šam-] “same, similar” above

IE: Skt. sama- “field, plain”: sama- “same, equal” above.

HS: Egyp. sm “field”: CA samā-watu “self, same” above.

**3.10.6** Proto-IE-HS stem [šam-] “summer”

IE: Av. hama “summer”, Ir. sam “summer”, W. haf, Corn. hāf id., OE. sumor, OHG., ON. sumar id., Skt. samā- “season, year”, Arm. am “year”. SS: §14.76; IEC D, 1111; WP. II, 429.

HS: Egyp. šm “summer”; *m šmw* “in the summer” (EG, §162: 2), CA samūmu “heat” also “simoom”.

For Arm. am “year” above, it is fr. CA ‘ām id.

**3.10.7** Proto-IE-HS stem [šam-] “fat”

IE: OE. smeoru “fat, grease”, ON. smjor id., Fris. smoarje “get fatty”, Du. smeuren “to stain, soil”, Toch. B šmare “smooth”, OIr. smiur “marrow, pith”, Lith. smarvė “stench”, Grk mūro “fragrant oil”, etc. IEC D, 1223, 1230.

HS: Akk. šamnu “oil” (AG, 102), Ug. šmn id. (UG, 534), CA simnu “fat, fatness, oil”: samina “grow fat, fatten”.

**3.10.8** Proto-IE-HS stem [šam-] “a plant”

IE: Mlr. semenn “rush”, Br. eon(en) “moss”, Lith. samanos id., MHG. semede “rush, reed”, etc. IEC D, 1126.

HS: Akk. šammu “grass, vegetable, plant” (AG, 102), Assy. šammu “plant, herb, weed” (King, 1898: 392), CA summa-tu fem. “a large mat (used like a carpet) made of the fronds of a kind of plant”.

**3.10.9** Proto-IE-HS stem [šaq-] “to pour, drink”: see the signification of CA vb below.

IE: Skt. sic- “to pour”, Av. hič- id., Tock. sik id., OHG. sīhan “filter”, OCS. sicati “urinate”.

HS: CA saḡā “to give a drink to s.o., make s.o. drink” is semantically identical with the meaning expressed by CIV ‘asḡā; sāḡiya-tu “streamlet”, Ug. šḡy “to drink” (UG, 532), Cush.: Ag. seḡu, Agm. seku id. (VPHS, 133, n. 257). For my comment on CA saḡā, see §3.2.87 above.

**3.10.10** Proto-IE-HS word [sinš-] “woman, female”. The earliest form may be [si’-t].

IE: Skt. snuṣā “daughter-in-law”, Grk nuós, Lat. nurus id., OCS. snûcha id., OE. snoru, OHG. snura id., Arm. nu id.: PIE \*snuso-. SS: §2.64; Meillet, Introd. 69; IEV: 42.

HS: Akk. sinniṣ-tu “woman, female” (AG, 99), Assy. sinniṣ(tu) “female, wife” (King, 1898, 374), Egyp. sms’-t “midwife”.

**3.10.11** Proto-IE-HS stem [šanay-] “old, year”

IE: Ved. sanaya- “old”, Av. hano id., Arm. hin id., Lat. senex id., Ir. sen, W., Corn., Br. hen id., Lith. sēnas id., Grk énos “of last year”. CCG: §5; Meillet, Introd. 68.

HS: CA mu-sinnu “old”: ’a-sanna “be old, advanced in years”; sana-tu, sanaya “year”, Egyp. šnw “endless time”, Ug. šny “year” (UG, 537), OAram. šnh id. (AG, 7).

For the Grk word above, see §2.17.37 above.

### 3.10.12 Proto-IE-HS two stems: [sīn-] “sun” and [šan-] “to shine”

IE: Goth. sunnō “sun”, OE. sunne, OHG., ON. sunnā id.

HS: CA sanā “to shine”; sanā’u “light, shining” also “beauty, brilliance”, Eth. sannāi “beautiful”. In NWS šny “to shine” (NWSI I, 1170-1171).

Otherwise, Hadr. sīn “goddess of the sun”, Akk. sīn, Mand. sin “moon-god, moon” (Mand. 327).

### 3.10.13 Proto-IE-HS stem [šin-] “bosom”

IE: Lat. sinus “bosom”.

HS: Egyp. šn’-t “breast”.

### 3.10.14 Proto-IE-HS word [sanay-] “hasten”

IE: Goth. sniumjan “hasten”, OHG. sniumi “swift”, with d-ext: OE. snūd “haste”, all fr. notion “to turn”, in ON. snūa “to turn”, according to SS: §14.24.

HS: Egyp. sn’n’ “to pass quickly”, fr. sn’ “to turn back”, CA sanna “to drive fast, hasten, hurry”; sananu “one who/which runs back and forth fast” hence also “round”; sunna “be changed”, ta-sannā “to change, alter”, etc. see §2.2.53 above.

### 3.10.15 Proto-IE-HS word [sēnt-] “sin”

IE: OHG. sunta “sin”, OE. synn id., ON. synd, Sw., Dan. synd id.

HS: Egyp. snt “sin”.

### 3.10.16 Proto-IE-HS stem [sana-] “to swim, bathe”

IE: Skt. snā- “to bathe”, Av. snaoða-, OIr. snāim “to swim”, W. nofio id., Grk naíō “to flow”, nēkhō “to swim”, Lat. nō, nāre id., Alb. not “swimming”, etc., fr. the same root in Lat. nubes “cloud”: PIE: snā-. SS: §1.73; IECd, 1233.

HS: CA sana-t (r. sny), said of the sky, “to rain”, of the cloud “to water the earth”, sanā “to water”.

### Comments

CA and IE words above are from a cpd of caus. /sa-/ and proot [nau-]. The proot is seen in Egyp. nw “new flood, inundation”; nw-t “a mass of water, lake, pool”; sw-nw “lake, pool”; Nw “the sky god”, Nw-t “a goddess who supplies the deceased with water”, CA<sup>308</sup> naw’u: *the simultaneous falling or disappearance of a star in the West (every 13 or 14 days) and rising another (i.e. its counterpart) in the East, a phenomenon to which rain, cloud, water, wind, heat, and cold are attributed*. These ’anwā’u (pl. of

<sup>308</sup> I have heard of *naw* as signifying “high rising waves” in some Arabic dialects.

*naw'u*) are 28 in number, each has its distinct name, and constitute the mansions of the moon's monthly path. With suffixed /-b-/: mu-nību “copious water”; ma-nābu “the road to water”; nawbu “send (domestic animals) very early to water”. Other meanings of [nwb] centers on “replace, substitute, alternate, etc.”, fr. *naw'u* above.

Returning to Egyp. [nw], we find that when combined with [-b], it expresses “to swim” as in nwbī “to swim” ~ nb ~ nbb id.

Egyp. nw and CA nau- are expected to be present in nearly all world's language families with such significations as ‘moon, sun, sky, cloud, or rain’.

**3.10.17** Proto-IE-HS word [sanḥ-] “to bind, tie; rope, band”. See §3.15.10 below.

IE: Skt. snāvā “rope, band”, OHG. snuor “rope”, On. snæri “twisted rope”, Goth. snōrjō “plaited basket”, Ir. snīm “spin”: PIE \*snē-. Meillet, *Introd.* 344.

HS: Egyp. snḥ-t “band, fillet”, fr. snḥ “to bind, tie”, CA sanīḥu “a kind of thread” = Egyp. nwḥ “string, cord, rope” as a vb “to bind, tie”, prob. Som. sun “belt”. See §3.9.24, also §2.13.5 above.

**3.10.18** Proto-IE-HS word [sanaḥ-] “to defeat”

IE: Hitt. šanahzi “attacks, asks for, approaches”, Skt. sanoti “to win”; sanitā “gain”, Grk avúm “to achieve”: IH \*senx-. IHL §36h; PIEP §3.4.

HS: CA sanaḥa “to repulse, drive back” also “harm”; CX 'ista-snaḥa “to inquire about, inquire into” (= Hitt. sanh- “to ask for” above).

For the meanings expressed by the Skt. & Grk words above: CA sunḥu “prosperity, fortune, good fortune; auspiciousness”.

**3.10.19** Proto-IE-HS stem [šarp-] in IE; [šapp-] in HS “serpent”

IE: Skt. sarpa- “serpent”, Lat. serpens, OLat. serpulla id., Grk herpetén “reptile”, hérpullos “a creeping plant”, Alb. gjrapën id.: Skt. sṛp-, Lat. serpere “to creep”: PIE \*serp-, analyzed as a sort of compound of \*ser-, as in Skt. sṛ- *to flow, haste*, etc. in §3.9.20 below and a suffixed \*-p-. SS: §10.41; IECD, 1131; WP. II, 502.

HS: CA saffu “serpent”, with infixed -r- resulting from dissim.: surfa-tu fem. “a kind of worm”, BHeb. špp “to glide, creep” also “serpent”, Syr. špp “to creep, glide” (OT, 1083). For dissim., see §2.17.80 above.

**3.10.20** Proto-IE-HS stem [sarau- or sarai-] “to run, flow; river, stream”

IE: \*sreu-, sru-, etc. with different exts “to run, flow, river, stream”;

With m-ext.: Grk rheūma “flood, current”, OIr. sruaim id., Lith. sraumuō id.;

With t-ext.: Skt. srōtas “river, stream”, Av. θrautō id., Lith. srautas, OIr. sruth id. etc. An infixed /-t-/ is seen in Grm. after /s-/: OHG strōm, OE strēam “stream”;

With various exts: Skt. sravami “to run, flow”; sravah “running, flowing”, sravati “it flows”, Grk rhēō “to flow”, Av. rud- id. IECD, 1275ff; SS: §1.36; SOE: §231; HGG: §209; WP. II, 703.

HS: CA saraya or sarā “to flow, run”; sarayānu “flowing, running”; sariy-yu “river, stream” as in the Koran (قد جعل ربك تحتك سريا) and in pre-Islamic poetry: Labid says:

«suḥuḥun yumatti'uhā 'aṣṣafā was *sariy-yu-hu...*»

Sab. m-sr-t “watercourse”, with m-ext.: Egyp. srm “water flood, torrent”, with f-ext.: srf “water flood, inundation”, Chad.: Siri sərə- “river, spring”, Jimbin sirya id. (HSED, n. 2260).

#### *Comments*

Stem [sarau-] above is a cpd of [sa-] and [rai-, rau-]. For [rau-, rai-] “river, stream, irrigation”: see §3.12.23 below.

#### **3.10.21** Proto-IE-HS word for “language, speech”

IE: Lat. sermō- “language, speech”.

HS: Egyp. srw “speech”.

#### **3.10.22** Proto-IE-HS word for “venerable, wise, i.e. *old*”

IE: Ir. sruith “old, venerable, wise”.

HS: Egyp. sr “elder, nobleman, chief, prince”, CA sursūru “prudent person” also “prince”.

#### **3.10.23** Proto-IE-HS stem [ša-] “to sleep”

IE: Hitt. šešzi “sleeps”, Skt. sasti id., Luw. 2<sup>nd</sup> imper. ša-aš-ša “sleep”. HCG: §87.

HS: Egyp. sš-t “night”.

#### **3.10.24** Proto-IE-HS stem [sar-] “join, bind”

IE: Lat. serere “to join, tie, arrange”, Skt. sarat “thread”, sarah “string”, Grk eirō “to join”. IECD, 1131; WP. II, 499.

HS: CA šarra “to bind, tie, wrap”, Heb. šarar “to bind up, bind together” (OT, 906), perh. Egyp. ser “be fettered, restrained” = CA šarra lit. “imprison and prevent”.

#### **3.10.25** Proto-IE-HS stem [sya-] “grain”

IE: Skt. sasya- “grain”, Av. hahya- id.: Gaul. acc. sasiam “rye”, Br. heiz “barley”. SS: §8.42.

HS: Egyp. sš-t “a kind of grain”, sw-t “grain”.

#### **3.10.26** Proto-IE-HS word [sa'id-] “happy”

IE: Cor. hoedh “happy, relaxed”, Ir. sadhbh “good thing, benefit”, sadhail “luxurious”, W. hawdd “easy, pleasant”, Toch. šātär “soft”, Lith. sodrus “thriving”. IECD, 1102.

HS: CA sa'du “luck, good fortune”; sa'īdu “happy”; sa'āda-tu “happiness, felicity, welfare”, Sab. s'd “beneficence” as verb “bestow a favor (deity)”; s'd-t “good fortune” (SD, 121-122).

#### **3.10.27** Proto-IE-HS stem [saḥ-] “to pour”

IE: Hitt. šuhhai “to sprinkle, pour”, Toch. B suwam “it rains”. HG: §87.

HS: Egyp. šḥi “to rise (of a flood)”, CA saḥḥa “to flow”; 'asaḥḥa caus. “to pour”.

For Toch. word: CA sāḥiya-tu fem., saḥsaḥu masc. “a kind of copious rain”.

### 3.10.29 Proto-IE-HS stem [šah-] “to bind”

IE: Hitt. iš-ha-a-i “to bind”; Skt. sã-, Av. hã- id., with. l-ext.: OE. sãl “rope”, ON. seil id. SS: §§9.16, 9.19. Burrow (SL, 290) reconstructs IE \*sHi-.

Sturtevant-Hahn (HCG: §75), like some other Indoeuropeanists, reject the connection of Hitt. išhai- with Skt. sã- etc. above and propose a connection of the Hitt. word with IE \*yōz- as in Lith. juosti “gird”, Av. yãsta-, Grk. ζωτός “girt”. They reconstruct IH \*γγóγz- > IE \*yōz-. For the Hitt. word, see *Comments* below.

HS: Egyp. seht “to tie, weave; net, snare”, Assy. sihitu “net” (Albright, JAOS, 47, 229).

With l-ext. as in Germ. above: CA sihalu “a rope with one stand”, Egyp. šhn (\*shl) “a special kind of cord”, Sab. s³hl “be bound; legally binding” (SD, 137-138).

#### *Comments*

Hitt. išhiyal “part of a woman’s clothing” is taken as a deriv. iš-ha-a-i “bind” above (Goetze, 1938: 13). For this Hitt. word, Akk. išahhu “a type garment”, CA wišāḫu, ’išāḫu “woman’s garment, scarf”, and is from wašā §2.15.24 above.

### 3.10.29 Proto-IE-HS stem for “seed; sow seed”

IE: Lith. sėti “to sow”, OCS. sēti id., Goth. saian “to sow”, OE. sawān, OHG. sāen, ON. sã id.; OE sãed “seed”, OHG. sāt “crop”, Ir. sīl “seed”.

HS: Egyp. s’ “a kind of seed”, st “to sow seed”, perh. CA zu’ān ~ zuwān ~ zi’ān “a kind of seed”.

### 3.10.30 Proto-IE-HS stem [šuh-] “urine”

IE: Hitt. šehur “urine”, OIcel. saurr “dirt, filth”, sūrr “sour, unpleasant”, Alb. shur, shurr “urine”. IHL: §46c.

HS: CA šuhāhu “urine”: šahha “urinate”, Akk. šahu “to wade (in slime)”, Har. šaḫat “urine”, Cush.: Bil. šaḡ, šah id., Qem. šaq, Kham. čaq, Kemant šaḡ “urine”, Aungi čaḡ-, čaq id., Chad.: Bokkos šaa “urine” (HED, 145; HSED, n. 533).

### 3.10.31 Proto-IE-HS stem [šauk-] “thorn, needle”

IE: Skt. sūci- “needle”, Av. sūkã- id.

HS: CA šauku “thorn”, Ge. šok “thorn”, Te. šokät, Tna. əšoh id., Har. usux, Amh., Arg. əšoh id., Ed. sūh, A. əsok id., etc. (HED, 33), Mand. šauka id. (MD, 440).

### 3.10.32 Proto-IE-HS stem [šiway-] “self, own, same”

IE: Skt. svayam “self”, Grk. heós “own”, OLat. sovos id., Umb. swesu id., Goth. swēs id., OLith. seve “self”, OCS. svoj “own”, W. hun “self”. IECD, 1343, 1350; WP. II, 455.

HS: CA siwā (or siwaya) “self”; sawā’u “same”; siyyu (fr. \*siwyu) “akin”; siyyā-nu (fr. \*siwyā-nu) dual “twin”, sãwã, sãwaya “be like, be equal”; sawã “together”, OAram. šwy “be equal to” (AG, 14), Mand. šauia “equal to, fit for” (MD, 440), BAram. šwh id., Heb. šawah “be like, equal, to resemble” (Ryder, 1974: 137; OT, 1039).

### 3.10.33 Proto-IE-HS stem [šuyu-] “evening”

IE: Skt. sāya- “evening”, Goth. seiþu id.

HS: Egyp. swy “evening”, CA mu-syu id., etc. see §2.10.13 above.

### 3.10.34 Proto-IE-HS word for “sister”

IE: Lat. soror “sister”, Skt. svasar- id., OIr. siur id., OCS. sestra, Lith. sesuo id., Goth. and common Germ. swister id.: PIE \*swesor-, a compound of the reflex. \*swe- and \*sor-. The second part of the compound (\*sor-) is seen in Av. hairiši- “female”. SS: §2.45; IECD, 1350f; IEV, 43; WP. II, 533; Meillet, Introd. 228, 350.

The nearest HS cognate to Av. seems to be CA sarārī, pl., “concubine, mistress”, Akk. šarra-tu “queen”.

The first element of the IE cpd *may be compared with* CA sawyu subs. used as in these examples: *She is his sister sawyu*, or, *He is her brother sawyu*: sawyu means, according to Jawhari, “from the same father and mother and one was born right after another”. Also, in CA “this X’s sauḡa-tu” means only in this context “this X’s *sister*”, but it has not developed to become an independent or general word for either “*sister*” or “*brother*”<sup>309</sup>. See §3.10.32 above.

### 3.10.35 Proto-IE-HS proot [ su’- or si’-] “son”

IE: Skt. sūnus “son”, Goth. and common Germ. sunus id., Av. hunu, Lith. sūnus, OCS. synû id., Toch. A seyo, gen. sg., B soy id.: PIE \*suyus, \*sūnus, etc. IEV, 42; SS: §2.41; IECD, 1335; WP. II. 470; Meillet, Introd. 350.

HS: Egyp. s’ “son”, Cop. še id.

### 3.10.36 Proto-IE-HS stem [šawṭ-] “to travel”

IE: Goth. sandjan “to send”, OE. sendan, OHG. sentan id.: OHG. sinnan “to travel, go”: OE. sīð “journey, course”, Lith. siusti “to send”, Latv. sūtīt id. SS: §10.63.

HS: Egyp. swtwt “to travel; journey”, CA šauwaṭa “to travel, make a long journey”, Heb., Aram. šwṭ “to wander about”. Also in Heb. šōṭ bā-’ārṣ in Num. 11.8, “to go over the earth, to travel through” (OT, 1040).

### 3.10.37 Proto-IE-HS stem [šaw-s-] “dry”

IE: Lith. saūsas “dry”, Latv. saus id., OCS. and common Sl. suchû “dry” OE. sēar id., Av. huošmna- id.: PIE \*saus-. SS: §15.84, IECD, 1338.

HS: Egyp. swš-t “dryness”, CA šawasu, said of water, “drying”; ša’isu “course, hard”: šw “be dry”, CA šawā “to heat, roast”, Akk. šāu “to roast”, Berb. zwu “to dry”, etc.

### 3.10.38 Proto-IE-HS proot [šę’-] “water”

IE: Toch. A swase, B swese “rain”, Grk ũei “it rains”, Alb. shiu “rain”, Skt. su- “to press out, extract”. SS: §1.75.

<sup>309</sup> Ug. ššlmt “wife” is clearly an obscure cpd. As a guess, the 1<sup>st</sup> element is šš “wife or female” (no evidence) + gen. /-l-/ “of” (as in CA) + mt “man” (as in Ug. and gen. Sem.).

HS: CA *arch.* šai'u "water", Egyp. sw "to drink", PChad. \*s- id., Berb. su id., Shil. su "to drink", Cush.: Sid. so "water". The real HS cognate is the root in CA tu-ša(tta)ī "it rains" (tu- = it); ši(tā)'u "rain, winter": see §2.8.12 above.

**3.10.39** Proto-IE-HS proot [šē'-] "lake, sea"

IE: Goth. saiws "lake", OE. sǣ "sea, lake", OHG. sēo id., ON. sær "sea". SS: §1.32.

HS: Egyp. syw "lake": CA šai'u "water" above.

**3.10.40** Proto-IE-HS proot [šaw-] "to sound; sound"

IE: Skt. svan- "to sound, make a noise", svar- id., Lat. sonus "sound", W. swn, OIr., Cor. son, Br. soun "sound". CCG: §77.2; IECD, 1346; WP. II, 524.

HS: CA CII šauwaṭa "make a sound, to sound"; šauṭu "sound", Syr. šauṭa id., Meh. šauṭ id., OffAram. šwt "order" (NWSI II, 966). The /-t/ is from /-t/: CA šuwwa-tu "sound, echo", EHeb. šwy "to command, give an order" (NWSI II, 965), etc. see §2.21.3.4 above.

**3.10.41** Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼauš- or ʼaiš-] "to be"

IE: Hitt. ešzi "is", OIr. is, W. ys, OE. is, Goth., OHG. ist, OLith. esti, OCS. jestu, Skt., Av. asti, Lat. est id.: PIE \*es- "to be". IECD, 252ff; Meillet, Introd. 144; SOE: §217. Sturtevant (IHL: §§52a, 63a) reconstructs IH \*ʼes-.

HS: CA ʼaisa "to be", etc. see §2.21.2.1 above.

To the stem above also belong, among others, Lat. essens "essence, nature", W. ias "nature" = CA ʼassu, n., "the source of everything, infrastructure".

**3.10.42** Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼas-] "to sit, seat, foundation", the same as [sad-] "to sit" in §3.6.48 above.

IE: Skt. ās- "to sit", Av. āh- id. Hitt. eš-zi "sits", Hier.-Hitt. asas "seat", Grk hēsmāi "to sit". IECD, 250f; Sturtevant, IHL, §51c.

HS: Egyp. s-ʼst, caus., "to sit"; ʼs-t "seat", Assy. uššu, CA ʼussu "foundation", etc. see §2.9.18.

**3.10.43** Proto-IE-HS word [ka-ʼes-] "bone", perh. fr. earlier [ka-ʼd/d-]. For [ka-], see §2.17.83 above.

IE: With the retention of [ka-] and loss of laryngeal: OCS. and common Sl. kostī "bone", Lat. costa "rib, coast, side" (SS: §4.16; WP. I, 186).

With loss of [ka-] and laryngeal: Skt. asthi, Grk ostéon "bone, kernel, rib", Lat. os, Av. astis "bone".

With loss of [ka-] and retention of laryngeal: Hitt. hastai id.

Also belong here, with suffixed proot [ka-]: Av. asčus "shin", Arm. oskr "bone", etc.

HS: Egyp. ḳ's "bone", CA ka'su, pl. ki'asu, "bone (of the finger)", Housa ḳiši "bone", Berb. ihs, iys "bone".

**3.10.44** Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼas-] "to burn; fire". The earliest form is [ʼau-].



IE: Skt. uṣ- “to burn”, Lat. ūrere id., Grk heuō “singe”, ON. usli “embers”: PIE \*us-, \*eus-. SS: §1.85; IECD, 256; Meillet, Introd. 144, DRLE, 49.

HS: CA ’ussu “ashes”, ’āsu “traces of burning or fire, ashes”, ’ā(ni)sa-tu fem. “fire”, Akk. išat- “fire”, Heb. ’eš, OAram. ’š id., Eth. ’esat id. Ug. ’š id., Har. isāt id., Ge., Amh., Č, E., M., Ms, Go. əsat “fire”, Gt. isat id. See §2.17.1 above.

### 3.10.45 Proto-IE-HS stem [’ais- or ’aus-] “to cure”; [’ās-] “physician”

IE: Grk iāomai “cure”, iātrós “physician”, fr. īza-, according to Sturtevant (Lang. 17, p. 86): Skt. iṣ- “set in motion, urge, animate”. SS: §4.86.

HS: Akk. āsū “physician”, CA ’āsī id.; ’isā’u “medicine”, Aram. ’sy’, Pun. ’esu “medicine” (DRS I, 27); CA ’āsa “to treat medically”

For the Skt. word: Egyp. ’s “make haste”.

### 3.10.46 Proto-IE-HS proot [’iš-] “testicle”

IE: OCS. ist, pl., “testicle”, ORuss. jesteš, dual, id., ON. eista id.

HS: Egyp. ’s-ti “testicles”, with k-ext.: Akk. išk- “testicle”, Ug. ’šk id., Eth. ’eskit, pl., id. (DRS I, 35), CA ’iska-tāni, dual, “two sides of vagina”.

### 3.10.47 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḥass- or ḥašš-] “to burn”

IE: Hitt. hašši “hearth”, Luw. hašša- id., Skt. āsa- “ashes, dust”. PIEP, §3.4.

HS: Egyp. ḥšḥs “to burn, be hot”, CA ḥassa ~ ḥašša “to burn” also “wipe off the dust”; ḥašḥasa, by redupl., “to burn”: see §2.10.21 above.

### 3.10.48 Proto-IE-HS stem [šu’-] “sow”

IE: Lat. sūs “swine, sow”, Av. hu- “swine”, OE. sū “sow”.

HS: Egyp. š’, š’y “pig”.

### 3.10.49 Proto-IE-HS word [ša-’aq-] “to see”

IE: Goth. saihwan “to see”, OE. sēon, ON. sjā, OHG. sehan: Hitt. šakuwa “eyes”.

HS: A corresponding HS word with a different caus. is CA ’aiḫaha “to understand”: See §2.10.14 above. Another cognate is CA ba-ḫā “to look at, watch”: see §2.13.25 above, etc.

### Comments

IE has, among others, another phonologically similar term expressing “look, see” as in OE. scēawian “to look at”, OHG. scouwōn, to look at, look”, etc.

An careful examination of IE words above may hint at two possibilities: (1) initial /s-/ is caus.- and this is a good possibility- or (2) the IE initial /sk-/ or /sḱ-/ stands in some words for /š-/ , a consonant phoneme found only in SA and Heb. According to the 2<sup>nd</sup> possibility, the HS cognates *may be* Akk. ša’u “to look at, look”, ESA s<sup>2</sup>w “to look after”, CA šai’-ān *arch.* “far-sighted” as a vb ša’ā *arch.*, etc. Another example that *may* fit here is ON. skōger “woods”, OE. sceaga “thicket” = CA šaḡaru coll. “tree”. The words also expresses in Grm. “hair” and in CA “beard” (§2.1.10, n. 4 above). IE cognates like Grk kháskō, Lat. hi(ā)scō, OHG. gescōn “hiccup”, etc. *may* correspond to

CA ǧaša' - "belch", Ge. g<sup>w</sup>äš'a ~ g<sup>w</sup>aš'a, Tna. g<sup>w</sup>šä'e, Te. g<sup>w</sup>äs'a id. See, for example, §3.4.25 above.

### 3.10.50 Proto-IE-HS stem [šūt-] "south"

OE. sūþ "south", ON. sūðr, OHG. sundan, etc. gen. Grm. SS: §12.48.

Akk. šūtu "South-wind". Egyp swtnw "crown of the South" is a doubtful cognate.

### 3.10.51 Proto-IE-HS stem [san-] "to smell"

IE: Lat. sentire "perceive by the senses", sensus "sense", in French sentir id. also "to smell". The earliest primitive meaning must be "to smell".

HS: Egyp. sn "to smell" (EHD II, 675), sns id. (EHD II, 678). See §§2.2.57.8 & 2.3.29 above.

### 3.10.52 Proto-IE-HS stem [ši-] "she"

IE: OIr. sī "she", W. hi, Br. hī id., OHG. nom. si, siu, acc. sia, sie "she", Goth. si "she", Grk hī id., Skt. sya "she, it", pronominal sa "he, she, it". IECD, 1137, 1142; Wright, 1962: §261; SL, 268ff.

HS: Akk. ši "she", Meh. se, si id., Egyp. sí, Cush. isi id., Akk. šū "he", Egyp. sw, Berb. -is, -es, -s, Cush. isa- id. The pl. forms are made by the addition of /-n/ to each form, hence Akk. masc. šun(u), fem. šina, orig. masc. \*šumu, fem. \*šunu.

### 3.10.53 Proto-IE-HS stem [šai-] "to sew, weave", infixed /-t-/ in HS.

IE: Skt. sīvyāmi, pp. syūtah "sew", Grk kas-sūō "sew together", Lat. suō "sew"; sūtus "sewn", OCS. šitŭ, etc. IECD, 1144.

HS: CA sataya, satā "to weave", Ug., Syr. šty "to weave", Egyp. stí id.

### 3.10.54 Proto-IE-HS word [sumd-] "pleasure"

IE: ON. sǣmd "honor", sōmi id., MHG. suome "pleasant", OE. ge-sōm "peaceable".

HS: CA samdu "arrogance" also "pleasure"; sumudu, Ug. smd "height" (UG, 533): CA sāmī "sublime, magnificent, lofty".

### 3.10.55 Proto-IE-HS [sap-] "stiff, hard, dry"

IE: Lat. stīpō "cram, enclosure", OE. stīfian "be stiff", Lith. stipti, stipmu "congeal, harden". IECD, 1290.

HS: CA suffu "the dry thing remains after taking off its covering (seed, etc.)"; saffa "bring things together or make them stick together", hence also "to weave", from notion "stick tightly together, glue".

BHeb. mšpt [špt] occurs only in the dual form and it has been interpreted as "folds, enclosures" or as "drinking-troughs", from notion of 'drink' as in CA سفت (OT, 631, 1084). The first interpretation is *correct* and the word = CA šuffatu is like *a large hall or enclosure with a high roof*. Moreover, the reason for the use of the dual form in Heb. is for the safety of cattle since the place is customarily divided into two parts: *small cattle*, esp. *kids*, are in one part and *big cattle* in the other part. The interchange of /š/ and /s/ is discussed at an exhaustive length in §2.2.48 above.

### 3.10.56 Proto-IE-HS [sa'-] “sate, satisfy; satiety”

IE: Toch. B. soy “be sated, satisfied”, Grk asāō “to sate”, OE. sēdan “to satisfy”, ON. seðja “to sate, satisfy”, Ir. saithighim id., Hitt. satas “satiety”, Lat. satis “enough”, satur “sated, full of food”, Lith. sotus id., Skt. sātan “pleasure”: PIE \*sāt-. IECD, 1113, WP. II, 444.

HS: Egyp. s', s'í “be satisfied, full”; s'-t, s'í “satiety”, caus. s-s' “to sate, satisfy” also “fill with food”.

#### *Comments*

The Grk word above is not from IE word sat̥ə-, but rather from caus. 'a-st̥ə “make sate”. Its exact cognate form is neither the IE nor the Egyp. words above, but rather Egyp. caus. ys' “to satisfy, to fill full” (see §2.3 above).

**3.10.57** Proto-IE-HS proot stem [su'-t] “daughter”, primarily “son”, with the fem. suffix /-t/ “daughter”. It is the base of the common IE words for “son”, i.e. *sūnu*, fr. IE \*su'-nu, whose final /-n/ is linguistically and historically identical with Skt /-nu/ in manu- and that of CA in ši-n[w-]u “brother from the same father and mother”: šanna “be about to give birth to a baby” (usu. animals).

IE: skt. sutā “daughter”, OIr. suth “offspring”.

HS: Egyp. s'-t “daughter”.

### 3.10.58 Proto-IE-HS word for ‘to sleep’

IE: Skt. svap- “to sleep”, Av. xap-, OCS sūpati id., ON. sofa, OE. swepan id.; ON. swefja “put to sleep”, OE. swebban id., Lat. sōpīre id. Subst.: Lat. somnis, somnium “dream”, OIr. sūan, W., Br. hun, Toch. A špām-, špān- “sleep”; Lith. sapnas “dream”, OCS sūnŭ, Skt. svapna- “dream, sleep”: PIE \*swep-, subst. sup-no-s, swep-no-s.

With infixed /-l-/: Goth. slēpan “to sleep”, OE. slæpan, OHG. slāfan “to sleep”.

HS: perh. Egyp. wpš (perh. by metathesis) “sleep, dream”. A form with infixed liquid similar to that of Grm. is CA sarifa “overlook, forget” (= γafala); n. sarfu. It is most likely that the IE-HS word includes the proot [suW-] “night” (§2.10.13 above), just like subāt “deep sleep”, sahiya (§2.11.30 above), sahida, sahira, etc., and that it is remotely related to words in §3.10.23 above.

### 3.11 *PROTO-IE-HS* /θ/

Proto-IE-HS /θ/, a voiceless interdental fricative. It is in PIE /t/ and in PHS /θ/.

The story of this essential phoneme is sad and grievous. Over millennia, poor /θ/ has incessantly fought a losing battle in world's languages, having either merged completely with phonemes such as /t/, /s/, or /ʃ/ in most languages or been retained in few languages loaded with injuries and only after giving up much of its remaining land, i.e. *roots*, to daughter /ð/.

#### 3.11.1 Proto-IE-HS stem [θag-] “thick”

IE: Ir. *tiug*, W., Cor. *tew*, Br. *teo* id., OE. *þicce* “thick”, ON. *þykk*, OHG. *dicchi*, Dan. *tyk* “thick”. CCG: §35.4.

HS: CA *waθīḡu arch* “thick” has never been widely used. The one in common use (with the same distribution of vowels) is *kaθīfu* “thick”: *kaθθu* id.; *kaθθa* “be thick, thicken”, etc.

#### 3.11.2 Proto-IE-HS stem [θak-] “to stick”, we have already seen this same stem as [tag-] in §3.5.3 above.

IE: OCS. *tŭknati*, *tykati* “to stick”, Bulg. *do-ticati* “to touch”, Pol. *do-tnac* id.

HS: CA *θakama* “to stick”: Egyp. *θk* “magnet”.

#### 3.11.3 Proto-IE-HS stem [θal-] “to destroy”

IE: OCS. *tŭlĕi* “to spoil”, Russ. *tleti* “be rotten”.

HS: CA *θalla*, with l-ext. as in IE, “to destroy utterly”: *θa’ā* “to spoil, corrupt”.

#### 3.11.4 Proto-IE-HS stem [θam-] “be intoxicated”

IE: Lat. *tēmētum* “intoxicated drink”, Skt. *tam-* “faint”.

HS: CA *θamila* “be intoxicated, drunk”.

#### 3.11.5 Proto-IE-HS word [θarb-]

IE: Bulg. *trbuh* “belly”, Pol., dial. *telbuch* id., Russ. *trebuch* “intestine”.

HS: CA *θarbu* “fat covering the belly and intestines”

#### 3.11.6 Proto-IE-HS stem [θar-] “to prattle”

IE: Lith. *tarti* “to say”, OCS. *trŭtorŭ* “noise”, Russ. *torotorit* “to chatter, prattle”.

HS: CA *θarθara* “be talkative, to prattle”, Egyp. *ḏr’ḏr’* “to boast”, Berb.: Kab. *ter* “to recite”.

#### 3.11.7 Proto-IE-HS word [θarn-] “to oppress”

IE: Ir. *trĕn* “strong”, OE. *þrecc* “force, oppression”, ON. *þrek* “strength, bravery”. SS: §4.81.

HS: CA *θarina* “to harm, oppress”, Ug. *θryn* “armor” (UG, 530).

### 3.11.8 Proto-IE-HS stem [θaul-] “to swell”

IE: Grk túlos “swelling”, Lat. tūmere “to swell”.

HS: Eyp. twyiw, pl., “swelling”, CA θauwala “to gather in a mass, agglomerate (bees)”; θūlu “penis (of a camel)”.

### 3.11.9 Proto-IE-HS stem [θār-, i.e. θawar-] “to stir, rise”

IE: OE. þweran “to stir, twirl”, OHG. dweran “to stir, turn swiftly”, Skt. twar- “hasten, hurry”.

HS: CA θāra “to agitate, rise, revolt, rebel, be stirred, excited”; CIV ’aθāra “to stir up”; θauwara “rise against”; θāwara “to jump”, Assy. šāru “to leap, fly, attack” (Albright, JAOS 47, p. 228, n. 76), BAram., Syr. šwr “to leap or spring upon any one”.

### 3.11.10 Proto-IE-HS word [θaur-] “bull”, related to [θār] above.

IE: Grk taûros “bull”, Lat. taurus id., W. tarw, Br. taro id., OPruss. tauris, Lith. tauras, OCS turu “wild ox”.

HS: Akk. šūru “bull”, Aram. twr, Syr. taurā, Heb. šōr id., Ug. šr, θr id., CA θauru, ESA θwr id. Tyloch, 1975: 59.

### 3.11.11 Proto-IE-HS word [’aθil-] “noble”

IE: OE. æþele “noble”, OHG. edili id., ON. oðlingr “nobleman, noble”, Toch. A atāl “man”. SS: §19. 36; IEV, 37; IECD, 39.

HS: CA ’aθīlu “noble”; ’aθālu “glory”. The early signification of /’θl/, as a noun, “god, deity”, as an adjective, “holy, sacred, sinless”: see §3.11.12 below.

### 3.11.12 Proto-IE-HS word [’aθir- or ’aθil-, as above] “air, wind, sky”

IE: Grk aîther “air, ether, sky”.

HS: Ug. iθl “wind” (UG, 537), CA ’aθīru “soft wind or breeze” also “morning, first, beginning”, Soq. ’ītin “sky”.

The early signification of the word was prob. “god, deity”, whence notions like “sky”, “wind”, “air”, and the like have developed. This early signification is preserved in Semitic: Akk. ašrat, Ug., Qat. ’θrt, with suffixed fem. -t, “goddess”.

### 3.11.13 Proto-IE-HS stem [’aθ-] “fire, smoke”

IE: Av. ātar “fire”, Alb. vatrë “fireplace”, Serb. vatra “fire”, Lat. āter “black, dark”. IEV, 179

HS: CA ’aθanu “smoke”: ’aθana “cause a fire to smoke”, Heb. ’ašan “smoke”, with loss of. \*’-: Eth tan, Syr. tennānā id. (Rabin, 1975: 89, n. 79).

### 3.11.14 Proto-IE-HS stem [waθ-] “old”

IE: Lat. wetus “old”, Hitt. witi “year”, OLith. vetušas “old”, Latv. vecs, OCS. vetûchû id.: PIE \*wet-

HS: Ug. yθn “old”, EHeb. yšn “old”, Egyp. θn’ (fr. \*’θn by metathesis < \*wθn) “be old”, CA CX ’ista-wθana (said of bees and camels) “become two groups: *old and young*”. See §2.3.50 above.

### 3.11.15 Proto-IE-HS word for “basket”

IE: Grk kártalos “basket”, Lat. crātis “wicker-work”; crassus “thick”, later *grossus*, Skt. kṛt- “spin”. SS: §12.63.

HS: Egyp. krḥt’ “basket”.

### 3.10.16 Proto-IE-HS stem [θau-] “to consume, thaw”

IE: Grk. thôian “to thaw, digest”, OE. þawian “to thaw”, MHG. douwen “to digest, consume”. IECD, 1370.

HS: Egyp. θ’ms “to consume”. Otherwise, see §2.3.30 above.

**3.11.17** *The following word correspondences represent surface exceptions, where we find PHS /ð/ = PIE /t/ and in some cases /d/.*

**3.11.17.1** Proto-IE-HS proot [ða-] “this, that”, will be studied in some detail in §3.19.3.4.4 below.

IE: Grk tó “this”, Toch. A täm id., Lith. tas id., Hitt. ta “then, next”, Hier. tas “this, that”, Skt. tad “that”.

HS: CA ðā masc. “this”, fem. ði-h, ðāka “that”, fr. ða and -ak, Eth. zē, Heb. zeh, Talm. dē(n) “this”, etc.

Another fem. counterpart of ðā is tī (tā, dimin. taiyā).

**3.11.17.2** Proto-IE-HS word [hanð-] “before” < [h̥a’ or h̥ā] (see *Comments* below).

IE: Hitt. hanti “before, front”, Pal. hantili “first”, Skt. anti “before, opposite, near”, Lat. ante “before”, Grk anti “opposite”, Toch. ente “opposed to”, OHG. enti “before, front”: PIE \*xanti-. IHL: §37c; IECD, 30.

HS: Egyp. hnt “before”, Som. intan id., perh. CA hanāðīðu, pl. of hanðu, said only of a mountain or cloud “before, the front side of anything (high, overlooking, e.g. *a cloud, mountain*) facing you”, hence, hanðīðu “master, hero, man of knowledge”.

Related words are:

3.11.17.2a IE: Skt. anta- “end”, Goth. andeis id., OE. ende, OHG. enti, ON. endi id., Alb. anë “side”, OIr. ind “top, tip, end”.

HS: Egyp. hnt’ “limit, tip, point”, CA hinðīðu “summit, top, tip”.

3.11.17.2b Proto-IE-HS word [hanð-] “face, forehead”

IE: OHG. ande “forehead”, ON. enni id., OIr. etan “forehead”, all orig. “the front side of”, according to Buck (SS: §4.205).

HS: Egyp. hnt’ “face, nose”: CA hanðu “the front side of, facing”,

### Comments

Egyp. evidence supported by CA makes it clear that /-n-/ here and nearly everywhere else is an infix, and that all words above have developed from a primeval proot [ḥaʾ] as in Egyp. ḥʾ “face”; ḥʾ-t “the forepart, what is in front”; ḥʾ- “the first” as in ḥʾ ʾ “the first one”; ḥʾw-tí “the first one, the finest or best thing of a class (i.e. *top*)”, CA ḥiḏāʾ “next, near, before, in front of”; mu-ḥāḏī “opposite to, in front of”.

Rabin (1975: 90, n. 11) correctly traces Akk. ir-tu “breast” to \*iztu and identifies with CA ḥiḏāʾ “above”.

**3.11.17.3** Proto-IE-HS word [šaḏar-] “to spread, strew, scatter”, a cpd of caus. [ša-] and stem [ḏar] in CA ḏarra, ḏarā “to scatter, spread, winnow”. The orig. stem is still seen in a number of CA roots such as *naḥara* “to scatter, strew, disperse”, *našara* (θ > š) “to spread, scatter”. It is also present in CA *ḥarra* “to scatter, disperse” also “to squander”. Some Old Arab scholars understood *ḥarra* as “scatter s.t. or anything with the hand”, while others understood it as only “scatter, etc.”. As a matter of fact, ḏarā is natively understood as “scatter s.t. or anything with the hand”. I have seen \*-θ- “*hand*” in some trilaterals, some of which have already been cited like maθθa ~ massa ~ mašša ~ matta, lamasa “touch with the hand” (§2.17.32 above), waθiʾa “to break the hand”, etc.

IE: Skt. str- “to spread, strew, scatter”, Av. star- id., Grk stórñūmi “to spread”, OIr. sernim id., Goth. and common Germ. straujan id.: PIE \*ster-, etc. IECD, 1286f; SS: §9.34; WP. II, 638f.

It seems that the PIE form was orig. \*sader-, later becoming \*ster- due to assim. resulted from the loss of the vowel /-a-/.

HS: Aram. derā “to scatter, winnow”, Ge. zarawa “to scatter”, Ug. dry “to winnow, scatter”, etc. see §2.1.12, n. 3 above.

**3.11.17.4** Proto-IE-HS word [šaʾḏ-] “magic”, fr. an older stem [ʾāḏ-] in CAʾauwaḏa CII “to utter a charm, pronounce a spell”. A derivative of this stem is Heb. təʾūdah “a divine percept”, CA taʾwīḏa-tu “spell, charm”, W., Br. hud “magic”, etc. SS: §22.42.

IE: ON. seiðr “magic, charm”.

HS: CA šaʾwaḏa-tu fem. [šʾḏ] “magic, charm”.

**3.11.17.5** Proto-IE-HS word [ḏurʾ-] “hand”

IE: W. dourn “hand”, Ir. dorn “fist”, Latv. dūre, dūris id., Alb. dorë “hand”.

HS: Egyp. ḏrʾ-t “hand”, Akk. duraʾ- “arm”, Ug. ḏrʾ “forearm”, BArm. deraʾ, CA ḏirāʾu id., Te. zāraʾ “arm, forearm”.

**3.11.17.6** Proto-IE-HS word [wuḏar- or waḏar-] “entrails”

IE: Skt. udara- “belly”, Av. udara- id., Lith. vedaras “fish entrails”, Lat. uterus “womb”: PIE \*wedero-.

HS: Egyp. wtr “entrails”, Ga. terri id., CA waḏara-tu fem. “piece of flesh without bone; vagina”, hence waḏara “to cut meat/flesh”.

**3.11.17.7** Proto-IE-HS word [ḥiḏā- or ḥiḏw-] “shoe”

IE: Lat. ōdō, ūdō “shoe”, Arm. awd “footwear”.

HS: CA ḥiḏā’u “shoe”, Egyp. ḥḏ-tí “a pair of white sandals”.

**3.11.17.8** Proto-IE-HS word [ḏaraq-] “void excrement”

IE: Bulg. driskati “have diarrhaea”, Lat. foria, pl., “diarrhaea”, ON. drit “dung, excrement”; drita v., OE. ge-dritan v.: PIE \*dher-. SS: 4.66.

HS: CA ḏaraḡa “to drop excrement (a bird)”, Akk. zṛḡ, etc. see §2.10.34, esp. n. d above.



### 3.12 *PROTO-IE-HS /r/*

Proto-IE-HS /r/ is perh. a trill or flap. It is in PIE /r/ and in PHS /r/

#### 3.12.1 Proto-IE-HS stem [*ar*-] “to move, rise”

IE: Hitt. *ar*- “to move, raise”, Skt. *ṛ*-, Av. *ar*- “to move, rise”, Grk *órnumi* “to move, rouse”, Lat. *ōrīrī* “to arise”, Goth. and common Germ. *ur-reisan* “to rise”, Arm. *ari* “to move”: PIE \**er*-. IECD, 889; SS: §10.11; WP. I, 136f; IER, 17.

HS: Egyp. *ʿrʿr* “to rise up, ascend”, CA *ʿarʿara* “to move, stir, shake”; *ma-ʿarra-tu* “a star”, Som. *ʿir* “sky”, OffAram. *ʿrr* “to stir up, incite” (NWSI II, 889-890), prob. Har. *ur bāya* “to jump in long jumps”, Sid. *ur* “to rise” (HED, 31): see §2.8.4 above.

The stem is very rich in closely related words:

3.12.1a IE: Grk *óros*, Dor. *ōros* “height, top, mountain”, Skt. *ṛṣva*- “high”: *ṛ*- “move” above. SS: §1.32; IECD, 890f.

HS: CA *ʿurura-tu* “top, summit”, Ug. *ṛr* (fr. \**ṛ*) “mountain” (UG, 534), Sab. *ʿrr* “mountain” (SD, 20).

3.12.1b IE: OIr. *or* “shore, coast, bank”, OBr. *or* “edge”, W. *or* “brim, limit”, Ukr. *jar* “cliff, steep bank”: Grk *óros* “mountain, height” above. IECD, 890.

HS: CA *ʿurrā*, dual, “side, limit”, Som. *ʿaro* “tip, end”. See below.

3.12.1c IE: Lat. *urvus* “boundary, precinct”, Osc. *urvu*, etc. ICED, 890.

HS: CA *ʿurwa-tu* “side, outskirts”; *ʿirwu* “side”; *ʿarā* (\**arawa*) “area, courtyard, wall, open space” = Ug. *ʿr* “city” (UG, 531), Phoen. *ʿr* “town” (PG, 135).

3.12.1d IE: Grk *órros* “tail, rump”, Hitt. *arras* “hump”, OHG. *ars id.*, OIr. *err* “tail, rump”, Arm or. SS: §4.18; IECD, 891.

HS: Egyp. *ʿr-t* “tail, rump”, CA *ʿarāʿiru*, pl., “side of the hump, upper part of a hump”, Berb. Kab. *ʿrur* “back”.

3.12.1e IE: Lat. *aries* “ram”, Umb. *erietu id.*, Grk *erithos* “kid”. SS: §3.26.

HS: Egyp. *ʿr-t* “ram”, CA *ya-ʿaru* “kid”.

3.12.1f IE: Skt. *arṇas*- “wave” also “flood”: *ṛ*- “move” above. SS: §1.32.

HS: CA *ʿaranu* “rising wave” also “flood”, Sab. *ʿrm* “dam” (SD, 19).

3.12.1g IE: OCS. *ratī* “war, battle”, Bulg. *rat* “war”, Skt. *raṇa*- “battle”: *ṛ*- “move”. SS: §10.13.

HS: CA *ʿarāra* “to battle, fight”; *ʿirāru* “fight, war”.

3.12.1h IE: Skt. *raṇa*- “strength”.

HS: CA *ʿirānu*, Tham. *ʿrr* “strength, force” (Branden, 1950: 517).

3.12.1i IE: Goth. *rinnan* “to run”, OE. *irnan* id.: Skt. *moti* “moves”. SS: §10.46.

HS: Som. *ʿarar* “to run away”, prob. Ga. *ara* “to chase”: CA *ʿiranu*, pl., “road”.

3.12.1j IE: Skt. *araṇya-* “forest”, fr. *araṇa-* “distant”. SS: §1.41.

HS: CA *ʿarīnu* “thicket of trees”, Sab. *ʿrn* “wooded land” (SD, 19): CA *ʿirānu* “distant, far”; CA *ʿarʿaru* “juniper”, Phoen. *ʿr*, Heb. *ʿarōʿēr* id. (NWSI II, 884).

3.12.1k IE: Skt. *ari-* “enemy”, in RV “stranger”. SS: §19.25.

HS: CA *ʿarīru* means, as in RV, “stranger”.

3.12.1l IE: Skt. *ārāt* “outside, space”, Lith. *oras* “air, weather”, orie “outside”, Latv. *ōra* “open field, the outdoors, the outside”, Hitt. *arha* “out, away”, *arhi* “outside”: PIE *\*ār-*. IECD, 32; WP. I, 79.

HS: CA *ʿarāʿu* “the outside, the outdoors, in the open air”, Heb. *ʿry* “open place”, Egyp. *ʿr* “wind”, Som. *ʿarro* “earth, ground”.

3.12.1m IE: Goth. *ara* “eagle”, OHG. *aro* id., OFris., OE. *earn* id., Grk *órnis* “bird”, Lith. *erelis* id., OCS. *orǫlŭ*. SS: §3.64; Meillet, *Introd.* 354; IECD, 889ff.

Sturtevant-Hahn (HCG: §58) connect Hitt. *harranis* “eagle” with the IE words above, and reconstruct IH *\*γorn-* = CA *γaranu* “hawk”.

HS: OAram. *ʿr* “bearded vulture” (NWSI II, 884), Egyp. *ʿr-t* “a kind of bird”, CA *ʿurru* “excrement of bird”: *ʿarra* “to drop excrement (only a bird)”, besides, CA *ʿurnūsu*, *ʿirnāsu* “quail”, etc.

**3.12.2** Proto-IE-HS word [*ʿar-guw-*] “red purple”. See §2.15.21 above.

IE: Skt. *raj-* “to grow red, be colored”; *rāga*, *rānga-* “color”, Grk *rhezō* “to dye”: PIE *\*reg-*. IECD: 1065; WP. II, 367; IER, 54.

HS: Assy. *argamannu* “red purple” (King, 1989: 324), Palm. *ʿrgwn* id., (NWSI I, 103), CA *ʿurḡuwānu* “red dye, purple”, Ug. *rgmn* “purple” (UG, 535).

**3.12.3** Proto-IE-HS word [*ʿarin-*] “brisk”

IE: ON. *ern* “brisk, vigorous”, OE. *eornost* “zeal, eagerness”.

HS: CA *ʿarinu* “brisk, lively”.

**3.12.4** Proto-IE-HS word [*ʿarn-*] “sin”

IE: Lat. *error* “error”, Goth. *airzei* id., OHG. *irrōn* id. SS: §16.77.

HS: Akk. *aran* “sin, injustice” (DRS I, 33), Egyp. *ʿr* “disgrace”, CA *rainu* from *\*ʿarūnu*, “overloaded with sins and guilts”. Note that both Akk and CA words also mean “debt”.

**3.12.5** Proto-IE-HS word [*ʿurwā-*] “ewe”

IE: Skt. *urā-* “ewe”, *uraṇa-* “ram”, Grk *arēn* “lamb”. SS: §3.25.

HS: CA 'urwā “mountain ewe, female mountain goat”, Sab. 'rw “female mountain goat” (SD, 7). (Wrong cognates are CA 'arhu “cow”, Ug. arh, etc. gen. Sem. id.). Cush.: Ga. re “sheep and goats, Som. ri “goat” (Castellino, 1975: 338).

### 3.12.6 Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼar-y-] “friend”<sup>310</sup>

IE: Hitt. ara- “friend, ally”, Grk ar-, in compounds, “man”, Ved. arya-, Skt. āryah “noble”, OIr. aire “nobleman”, Arm. ajr “man”, Lith. orus “dignified”: PIE \*ēr-, etc. IECD, 34, 36; WP. I, 80; SL, 40.

HS: Egyp. 'rí “friend, associate, companion”, Ug. 'ry “kinsman”: CA 'ariya “to stick to a person, be a friend to”.

### 3.12.7 Proto-IE-HS stem [raʼ- ~ ʼar-] “to see > think”

IE: OHG. rāttan, ON. raða “to advise”, OCS. raditi “to care, be anxious”, Skt. rādhyati “is successful”, Ir. rādim “to speak”, all fr. PIE \*reX- in Lat. rēri “to think, reckon, believe”. SS: §18.21; PIEP: §9.4c.

HS: CA CVIII 'irtaʼa “to deem, meditate on; consider”: raʼā “to see, perceive, consider”; raʼyu “opinion, view”, Heb. rāʼā “to see” also, caus., “cause to see, know”, Sab. rʼy id., Har. riʼa “to see”, Ge. rəʼəyā, Tna. rāʼaʼyā, Te. raʼa, etc. see §§2.7.11, 2.7.31, 2.4.34, 2.10.11, etc. above.

### 3.12.8 Proto-IE-HS word [ʼariš-] “to ask, request”

IE: Grk erōtāō “to ask, request”.

HS: Ug. 'rš “to ask, request” (UG, 530), Akk. erēšu “to ask” (AG, 74).

### 3.12.9 Proto-IE-HS word [γars-] “to plant”

IE: Hitt. arse-mi “to plant”; arsis “plantation”, Cz. rašit “to burgeon”, Av. arəš- “to stab”, Skt. ān-aršami id. IECD, 891.

HS: CA γarsa “to plant”; γarsu “plantation”, Sab. 'rs<sup>3</sup> “plantation” (SD, 20), ESA 'rs “plantations” (Beeston, 1962: 11) = CA \*ʼayrāsu id. is a rare. The stem {ʼaCCāC} is common to a large classes of noun like ʼaʼyādu “holidays”, ʼahjādu “grandsons”, etc. The usu. broken pl. of γarsa-tu fem. is coll. γarsu.

### 3.12.10 Proto-IE-HS stem [γur-] “mouth, jaw”

IE: Lat. ōs “mouth”, Hitt. ais id., Skt. āsas id., OPruss. austa, OCS. usta, nom.-acc. pl., id.: Lat. ōra, OE. ōra “edge”, etc. below in §3.12.11.

HS: Egyp. 'r-t “the lower jaw, jaw-bone”, CA γuzzu ~ γurru “jaw-bone or mandible” (also γāru “palate”). LA treats γurru as a dial. variant of γuzzu.

### 3.12.11 Proto-IE-HS stem [γur-] “door, edge”

IE: Lat. ōstium “door, entrance”, ōra “edge, coast”, OE. ōra “edge, bank”: ōr “beginning”, OCS. ustīna “lip”. SS: §§4.25-4.26.

<sup>310</sup> Final /-y/ here signifies *belonging to*. Accordingly, 'ar alone = man.

HS: CA *γurra-tu* “beginning, first”; *γirāru* “edge”; *γurra-tu* “beginning”, Egyp. *ʿrr’t* “gate, door”, Berb. *ir* “bank, side”.

### 3.12.12 Proto-IE-HS word “jealous, envy”

IE: Skt. *īrṣ-* “be jealous, to envy”, Av. *ərəši-* “envy”, Grk *areiē* “threats”, Goth. *airzeis* “angry”, OE. *yrre*, OSax. *irri* id., OFris. *īre* id., Lith. *erzinti* “to irritate”, *iršti* “be angry”, OIr. *ir* “wrath”: PIE *\*īrs-*, etc. IECD, 251, 432f.

HS: *perh.* CA *γīra-tu* fem. “jealousy, envy” as a vb *γāra*, Heb. *ʿīr* “anger, wrath, anguish”.

A possibly related root is in CA *γarīda* “to yearn, be filled with longing”; *γarīdu* “restless, impatient, bored”, SL *mu-γrīd* “one who hates, one who envies”.

### 3.12.13 Proto-IE-HS word [ḥeṛṣ-] “spear”

IE: Av., OPers. *arstis* “spear”, Arm. *ašte* id.

HS: Ug. *ḥrṣ* “a kind of weapon” (UG, 537), CA *ḥaraṣa* “to pierce”.

### 3.12.14 Proto-IE-HS word [ḥaraθ-] “to plow”

IE: Hitt. *harra-* “to break, pulverize, ruin”, connected by Sturtevant (IHL: §37f) with Hitt. *haraš* “plough, harrow” and identified both with Lat. *orātrum* “plow”, Grk *árottron* id., Ir. *arathar*, OCor. *aradar*, W. *aradr* id., Goth. *arjan* “to plow”, ON. *erja*, OE. *erian* id., Lith. *arti*, OCS. *orati* id. SS: §8.21; IECD, 32, 35; WP. I, 78.

HS: Akk. *erēšu* “to plow”, CA *ḥaraṯa* id.; *ḥirāṯatun* “plowing”, Ug. *ḥrṯ*, Heb. *ḥāraš* id., Palm. *ḥarīšā* “plowing”, ESA. *ḥrṯ* “to plow”, Ge. *ḥarasa* id. (Tyloch, 1975: 58, n. 20).

Evidence from CA plainly indicates that final */-θ/* above is a proot added to stem [ḥar], which *alone* expresses “to plow”, as in CA *ḥarra* id.: comp. CA *mi-ḥarru* inst. “ploughshare” = CA *miḥrāṯu* inst. id., Heb., Aram. *maḥarēšā* id., Ge. *māḥras* id., etc.

An old caus. form of [ḥar-] *may be* Skt. *sīra-* “to plow”. Otherwise = Akk. *šir’um* “furrow”, etc.

The only meaning that can be assigned to [-θ-] is “earth, land, soil”: see §2.12.43 above.

### 3.12.15 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḥur-] “master, nobleman”

IE: Lat. *erus* “master”, OIr. *aire* “nobleman”, Arm. *aru*, adj., “male”, Lith. *orus* “dignified”, Skt. *aryah* “master, lord”, Grk *ar-* (in compounds: IECD, 34) id, connected by Sturtevant (IHL: §56a) with Hitt. *ešhaš* “master”.

Hitt. *ešha-a-aš* is strikingly similar to CA *’ašḥāṣu* pl., “person”; *šahṣiyya-tu* “great figure, notable person”.

HS: Egyp. *ḥr* “master”, CA *ḥurru* “nobleman, noble”, OAram. *ḥr* “nobleman” (AG: 10), Heb. *ḥōr* “noble, free-born”, Syr., BAram. *ḥrr* “make free” (OT, 349).

### 3.12.16 Proto-IE-HS proot [ḥau-] “to have”

IE: Hitt. *har-zi* “has”; *harharan* “holder”, connected by Sturtevant (IHL: §37d) with Grk *arkéō* “be strong enough, ward off”, Lat. *arceō* “to shut in”, *arca* “chest” (?).

HS: The Hitt. word may be cognate with either

(a) CA 'aḥraza “to have, obtain” also “to keep, safeguard, protect”; ḥirzu “garrison, stronghold” < [ḥwz], hence ḥāza “to have, obtain”, this is in turn from proot [ḥaw]: CVIII 'iḥtawā “to have within, collect and possess”.

(b) Egyp. ḥr “to seize”; ḥrw “possessions, property”; ḥr-t “that which belongs to someone, possessions”.

### 3.12.17 Proto-IE-HS word [ḥark-] “to destroy”

IE: Hitt. harkzi “is destroyed”, caus. harganuši, Arm. harkanem “split, fell”, Ir. orgaim “to destroy, strike”, Toch. A arkāmn-, B erkau- “funeral place”. HCG: §80.

HS: Egyp. ḥrsk “to destroy”, Ug. hrg “to kill” (UG, 533), OAram. Moab., Samal hrg id. (NWSI I, 293), Sab. hrg “to kill, slaughter”; htrg “to fight with” (SD, 56), CA haraḡa “to kill to an excess” also “riot”.

For Toch. word: CA ḥaraḡu “wooden bier”.

### 3.12.18 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḥary-] “to inquire”

IE: Grk erēō “to inquire”, Myc. ereu- “to inspect”, etc. IECD, 248. Also belong here Grk ereunāō “to search, try”, Arm. oronem “to seek, search”, OE. rēonian “to plot, contrive”, ON. raun “trial, experience, suffering”. IECD, 1076.

HS: CA ta-ḥarrā, ta-ḥarraya “to inquire into, investigate, seek, search for; inquiry”; hariyyu “capable”; ḥarā “to wane, become ill”; harrā “to annoy, disturb”, EHeb., JAram. ḥrr “litigation” (NWSI I, 407).

### 3.12.19 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḥar-] “grief, pain”

IE: Skt. ārti- “misfortune, pain”, Av. āri- “hurt, injury, pain”

HS: Egyp. hr-t “grief, sorrow, lamentation”, Sab. ḥry “harm, damage” (SD, 72), CA ḥarwa-tu “pain”, ḥarr- “grief, sorrow”.

### 3.12.20 Proto-IE-HS stem [haur-] “wide”

IE: Skt. uru- “wide”, Grk eurús id.

HS: CA hauru “wide, far stretched”, Egyp. hrhr “to extend, prolong”

### 3.12.21 Proto-IE-HS dial. word [‘irāz-] “clothing”

IE: OCS. riza “linen cloth”, Russ. riza “chasuble”, Bulg. riza “shirt”, Lith. ryzai “rugs”. SS: §6.12.

HS: Har. irāz “cloth, garment”, Ge. ‘araz “cloth”, S. irāz, W., Z. əraz, Amh. əriz, ariz “hide of animal serving to cover nakedness” (HED, 32).

### 3.12.22 Proto-IE-HS word [ḥa’war- or ha’war-] “abundant water”: [ḥa’] & [ha’] = *abundant*: see §2.4 above.

IE: Hitt. hurniyanzi “they sprinkle”, connected by Sturtevant (IHL: §37h) with Skt. vāri, Toch B wār “water”, Av. vār “rain”, vairi “lake” (§3.16.13 below).

HS: Egyp. ḥwr “a mass of water” with ḥr-t (\*ḥwr-t) “watercourse” ~ hyr, hr (\*hwr) “lake”: CA ḥairu “a collection of water”; ḥā’iru “basin, watercourse” also “pond”, ḥairu

also “clouds that keep on pouring water”; ta- ħaiyara said of earth “be filled with water” ~ hauru “lake”, Sab. hwr “watercourse, pool” (SD, 57), Som., Ga. haro “lake”.

On the other hand, Egyp. wr’t “a mass of water” with wr “lake”, Som. war “pool” (§3.16.13 below).

### 3.12.23 Proto-IE-HS proot [rau-] “stream; irrigation”

IE: Lat. rīvus “brook”, OCS reka “river”, Goth. rinnō, OE. riþ “brook”: Skt. raya- “to flow”: PIE \*rei-. SS: §1.36; IECD, 1068; WP. I, 139ff.

HS: CA riwa-n “drinking to the full”; rawā “to water, irrigate, drink”: raiyu “irrigation”, Heb. rāwā “to drink to the full, be sated with drink, drenched”, Eth. rwy “be sated with drink, be watered” (OT, 966), OffAram., JAram. rwy “to irrigate, saturate” (NWSI II, 1063), Sab. rwy “to provide a water supply” (SD, 119), Berb. rwa “be wet”.

### 3.12.24 Proto-IE-HS stem [rauḥ-] “rest”

IE: OHG. rouwa “rest”, ON. rō, OE. rōw id., Grk érōē id.: PIE \*rewō-, etc. IECD, 1095; WP. I, 144.

HS: CA rāḥa-tu “rest, comfort”, OffAram., Palm. rwḥ, Pun. rḥ, rwḥ’ “tranquility, respite” (NWSI II, 1062), Heb. rewaḥ “relief, esp. from straits” (OT, 966), Berb.: Kab. raḥa “rest”

Egyp. rhyn (< \*ryhn < \*rwḥyn) “to rest; rest”: cf. CA rawḥana-tu “rest”: ta-rawḥana “to rest”.

### 3.12.25 Proto-IE-HS stem [ram-] “be inactive”

IE: Skt. ram- “to stand still, rest”, Av. ram- “to stand still”; rāma “rest, pleasure”, Lith. ramus “quiet”: rimti “to become quiet”, Goth. rimis “quiet”, Ir. fo-rimin “to put”. IECD, 1062; WP. II, 372.

HS: Egyp. rmn “inactivity”, CA’a-ramma “be inert, sluggish”, Heb. rəmiyā “sloth, slack” (OT, 983), Shil. rmi “be tired” (Applegate, 1958: 63), with z-ext.: CA ’irma’azza “to stand still”.

#### Comments

The IE-HS words above are from a cpd of prep. [ra-] and stem [man-] “stay, remain”. The stem has lost its final /-n/ in all except Egyp. and OIr. CA 2<sup>nd</sup> /-m/ could be fr. /-n/ or, *much more likely*, fr. another prep. /m/. See §2.15.25 above.

### 3.12.26 Proto-IE-HS word [ḥerg-] “loathsome act, crime, sin”

IE: Hitt. hurkel, nom.-acc. sg., “horror, abomination, loathsome act”, Luw. hurkil “crime”, Goth. ga-wargjan “to condemn”. Bomhard, 1976: 223.

HS: CA ḥirġu “crime, sin”; ḥāriġu “criminal”; ḥaraġa, ’aḥraġa “to prove guilty, put someone in a critical situation”, Sab. ḥrg “bring a lawsuit against” (SD, 62), Nab. ḥrg “be forbidden” (NWSI I, 403), Mand. hrš “to forbid, prevent, prohibit” (MD, 153).

### 3.12.27 Proto-IE-HS stem [rai-] “wealth, growth”

IE: Skt. *rās* “property, wealth, riches”, Av. *rāyō*, gen. sg., “wealth”, Lat. *rēs* “property” also “thing, affair”. PIE *\*rē-*, *\*rēi-*, etc. SS: §11.41; Meillet, *Introd.* 78.

HS: CA *ray’u* “growth, wealth” also “increase, multiply (crops, food, grain, wheat, etc.)”, Chad.: Tangale *riy* “multiply” (HSED, n. 2126), with š-ext.: CA *rīšu* “affluence, fertility, growth”, but in Heb. *rīš* “poverty”.

**3.12.28** Proto-IE-HS stem [*’īr-*, *’air-*] “air, wind”

IE: Lat. *āēr* “air”, OIr. *āer*, Br. *aer* id., Lith. *oras* id. cl

HS: CA *’īryu* “south wind”, closely related to *’awūru*, *’īru* “sky”, Berb. *arrar* “air”.

**3.12.29** Proto-IE-HS stem [*’ar-*] “do, make”

IE: Grk *en-airō* “do in, kill”, Lat. *p-arō*, *p-arāre* “do, make”, Arm. *ařnem* “do”, *arar* “action, deed”. IECD, 31-33.

HS: Egy. *yr* “to do, make”, etc. see §2.1.6.7, n. 6c above.

**3.12.30** Proto-IE-HS stem [*’ard-*] “elevated, high”

IE: Lat. *arduus* “elevated, steep”, Ir. *ard* “high”, ON. *orðgr* “steep”, Av. *ərədwa-* “lifted up, elevated”. SS: §12.31.

HS: CA *’ardu* “elevated, standing erect”; *’arada* “to rise, raise, stand erect”, etc. See §3.12.1 above.

### 3.13 *PROTO-IE-HS* /l/

Proto-IE-HS /l/ is a dental lateral. It is in PIE /l/ and in PHS /l/.

#### 3.13.1 Proto-IE-HS word [la'y-] “slow”

IE: Lat. lassus “tired, weary”, Grk lēdeîn “be tired”, Lith. lētas “slow, calm”, Latv. lēns “slow, gentle”, OHG. laz “late”, OE. læt “late, slow”, ON. latr “slow”: PIE \*lē-. SS: §14.22; PIEP: §9.4c; IER, 35.

HS: CA la'ā “be slow, tardy, to retard” also “be tired, exhausted, in strained condition, needy”; CVIII 'ilta'ā “become bankrupt”; la'yu “slowness, lingering, hardship, exertion”, JArām. l'y “to wear oneself out, toil” (NWSI I, 561), BHeb. “be wearied, exhausted”, Syr., BAram. l'y id. (OT, 507), Akk. la'ū “weak”, Chad.: Sura laa, Angas “sickness, pain” (HSED, n. 1631).

#### 3.13.2 Proto-IE-HS stem [la'-] “joy”

IE: Lat. laetitia “joy”, Grk apo-laúō “have the enjoyment, benefit of”, W. llawen “joyful”, Br. laouen id., Goth. launs “reward”. SS: §16.10.

HS: Egyp. l'ry “joy”, Har. & all Eth. dialects ələll “shout of joy” (HED, 25), CA la'āli'u “complete happiness”: la'la'a, ta-la'la'a “to shine, glitter”.

#### 3.13.3 Proto-IE-HS stem [lab-] “lip; to lick”

IE: Lat. labrum, labium “lip”, OE. lippa, OHG. leffur “lip”, Pers. lab id.: Lat. lambere (\*labbere) id. IECD: 655; EM, 513; SS: §4.25; DRLE, 100f; IER, 34.

HS: Housa leebe “lip” (Parsons, 1975: 430), Som. lef “to lick”, CA labba “to lick with the lip (a sheep its young)”: PHS [lab-] with a basic meaning “to love, desire” as in CA lablaba “to sympathize with, feel pity for; affection”; labba-tu fem. (in 'ummun (= ‘mother’) labba-tu “affectionate, loving”; lubbu “heart”, as *center of feeling and emotion*, Ug. lb “heart”, Akk. libbu “heart” also “desire” (AG, 85) = Skt. lubh- “desire”, OE. lufu “love”, OHG. liubī id., OCS. ljuby id., Lat. lubit “love”, lubīdō “strong desire”, Osc. loufir “love”.

CA labba above = OHG. laffen “to lick”, MHG. leffen id., OCS. lobûzû “kiss”.

Moreover, CA lubbu also means “brain, marrow”; labba-tu “front of the chest”, Som. lab-ti “breast” (Kirk, 1905: 207) = OCS. lûbu “skull”, Russ. lop “forehead”.

#### 3.13.4 Proto-IE-HS stem [lag-] “to destroy”

IE: Skt. ruj- “to break, cause pain”, Lat. lūgēre “to mourn”, Grk lugrós “mournful”, Lith. lūgoti “to beg”. SS: §4.86; IECD, 716.

HS: Egyp. leg “to destroy”, CA laġġa “inflict pain on, suffer or make *another* suffer”, occurs in Poet.:

«dalwu 'irākin laġġa bī maniyuhā» (LA), where *laġġa bī* is ambiguous and may mean either ‘*inflict pain on me*’ or ‘*I inflict pain on him*’.



### 3.13.5 Proto-IE-HS word [lagʷ-] “shelter”

IE: Toch. A lake, B leke “bed”, Grk lékhos id., Lat. lectus id., Goth. ligan “to lie down”, ON. leg “burial-place”, Cz. noc-leh “night’s lodging”: PIE \*leghō, leghos. IECD, 669; HGG: §200.

HS: CA ma-lğaʷu “shelter, refuge”: lağaʷa “take refuge”; lağʷu *arch.* signifies “wife” and also “stronghold”.

### 3.13.6 Proto-IE-HS stem [lag-] “gathering of anything (of sounds, water, darkness, plants, etc.)”

IE: Grk légō “to gather, count, read, say”, Lat. legere “to gather, choose, read”, W. lleain, Br. lenn “to read”: PIE \*legō-. IECD, 670; WP. II. 422; IER, 35.

HS: CA CVIII ʾiltağğa “be gathered together”; lağğa-tu “sound” also “tumult”.

#### *Comments*

The radical /g/ interchanges with /γ/, a fact to which I draw attention on some occasions in Chapter II (see, for example, §2.13.22 above): comp. CA layā “to say, speak”; luyā-tu “language”, etc. see §2.17.49 above.

### 3.13.7 Proto-IE-HS stem [lag-] “liquid”

IE: Ir. legaim “to dissolve, melt”, Gaul. lag- “damp”, ON. leka “to leak”, OE. leccan “to water”, Alb. lag “wet”. IECD, 658; IER, 35.

HS: Egyp. legʷi “liquid”, Cush.: Ga. laga “brook, stream”, Oromo laga, Sid. laga “river” (HSED, n. 1637), CA luğğa-tu “wave, water”, luğğu “depth of the sea”, Ug. lg “liquid measure” (UG, 534), EHeb., OffAram., JAram. lg id. (NWSI I, 566),

### 3.13.8 Proto-IE-HS stem [lak-] “to kick”

IE: Grk lāx “to kick with the feet”; laktízō “to kick”, Pers. lakd id. IECD, 660.

HS: CA lak-: see §2.1.10 above. This is ultim. The same as *rakala* “kick with the feet”.

### 3.13.9 Proto-IE-HS stem [lak-, rak-] “to incline”

IE: Hitt. lagari “inclines, lies”, Lith. lenkti “to bend, bow”, linkēti “to incline to”, OCS. lešti “to bend, turn, twist”: PIE \*lonqu-, etc. SS: §16.22; WP. II, 435; IECD, 679.

HS: Egyp. lk “to incline toward”, CA rakā “to incline toward, lean on”.

### 3.13.10 Proto-IE-HS stem [lam-] “hair”

IE: Skt. loman- hair”.

HS: CA limma-tu fem. “head hair”, Har. rammāt “hair waves”. Leslau, HD, 135.

### 3.13.11 Proto-IE-HS word [šalʷ-] “salt”

IE: Lat. sāl, sālis “salt”, Grk áls id., Goth. salt id., OCS. sol-, Toch. A sāle id.

HS: Egyp. šrʷt “salty land”.

### 3.13.12 Proto-IE-HS word [lapʷ-] “to peel off; leaf, plant”

IE: Grk lépō “to peel off”, Lith. lapas, Latv. lapa “leaf”, Slov. lepen id. SS: §8.56; IECD, 680; IER, 36; WP. II. 429f.

HS: CA lafa’a, lafā, etc. “to peel off” (lafata id); ma-lfūf “cabbage”, līf “turnip”, Heb. lepet id., Syr. lefto id., Egyp. rp’t, pl., “flower, young herb and plant”, Har. läfu “tree” may belong here or to the root below.

### 3.13.13 Proto-IE-HS word [lep-] “leaf”

IE: Goth. laufs “leaf”, OE. lēaf id., ON. lauf “foliage”, Russ. lupit’ “bark”: Lith. lupti “to peel off, flay”. SS: §§8.53, 8.57; IECD, 720; CCG: §§47, 116; WP. II. 418; IER, 37.

HS: CA lifu, r. lyf, “palm fibers”, Chad.: Log. lefi “leaf”, Bud. lebi id. (Müller, 1975: 56, n. 22).

OIr. luib “herb”, ON. lyf “herb with healing or magic power”, OE. lybb “medicine, poison”: CA lablābu “a kind of herb used as medicine”.

### 3.13.14 Proto-IE-HS stem [lip-] “fat; liver”

IE: Grk lípos “fat”; liparós “oily”: Skt. ripram “dirt”, OE. lifer “liver”, OHG. libaro, lifr id., Arm. leard id. IECD, 695; SS: §4.45; WP. I. 205f.

HS: Akk. lipû “fat” (AG, 85), CA laffā’u “fat-thighed”, Ga. lafe “bone”, Som. laf id. (Zaborski, 1975: 324), Yibir lafif, Midgan lafeiti id. (Kirk, 1905: 207): Egyp. ref (\*lef) “to swell”.

### 3.13.15 Proto-IE-HS word [lauθ-, lūθ-] “dirt”

IE: Lat. lutum “dirt, mud”, polluere “to pollute”, Grk lūma “filth, dirt”, Mlr., Ir. loth “dirt, filth”, Alb. lucë. IECD, 722; IER, 37.

HS: Akk. lūtu “dirt”, CA lauwaθa “make dirty, pollute, stain”.

### 3.13.16 Proto-IE-HS word [lauḥ-] “board”

IE: Lith. lova “bed”, Latv. lāva “bench”, OCS., Russ. lava id., ON. lōfi “threshing floor”, orig. ‘a piece of board’: PIE \*leu-. SS: §7.24; WP. II, 407; IECD, 667.

HS: Akk. lēu, Mand. luha “plank, tablet” (MD, 232), CA lauḥu “board, plank, tablet”, Ugr. lḥ “tablet” (UG, 536), Heb. lūḥ “board”, Syr., Eth. lwḥ (OT, 515).

### 3.13.17 Proto-IE-HS stem [lau-] “color”

IE: OIr. lī “color”, OCor. liu id., W. lliw, Br. liou id., Gaul. liuo, Lat. līuor. CCG: §11.

HS: CA launu [lwn] “color”, Egyp. ywn id., with ṭ-ext.: CA lī-ṭu id.

### 3.13.18 Proto-IE-HS stem [lai-] “lion”

IE: Lat. leō “lion”, Grk léōn id., OIr. leo OBr. leu id., OE. lēo, ON. leo, ljon, OHG. lewo id., Lith. liūtes, OCS. līvû id., Alb. luâ. IECD, 678f.

HS: Egyp. lew “lion”, with θ-ext.: CA laiθu id., Heb. layiš, BAram. layit id.

### 3.13.19 Proto-IE-HS stem [lain-] “pliant, soft”

IE: Lith. liaunas “pliant, slender”, OIr. lian “soft”, ON. linr “soft, gentle”, Icel. lina “to ease”; lin-, in cpds, “soft”. IECD, 673, 694; WP. II. 387.

HS: CA laiycinu “pliant, tender, flexible”.

**3.13.20 Proto-IE-HS word [lahab-] “flame”**

IE: Lith. liepsna “flame”, Latv. liesma id., Ir. laom “blaze”, ON. leiptr “lightning”. IECD, 704.

HS: CA lahabu “flame”, Egyp. rhbw id., Heb., Eth. lhb id.

**3.13.21 Proto-IE-HS word [laḥak-] “to lick; tongue”**

IE: OE. liccian “to lick”, OIr. ligim id., OCS. and common Sl. lizati “to lick”, Lith. liežti “to lick” with liežuvis “tongue”, Arm. lezu “tongue”, Skt. lih- “to lick”, Goth. laigōn id., W. llyw id., llwy “spoon”. SS: §4.59; WP. II, 400; IECD, 671, 690f.

HS: Egyp. lekh (\*lehk) “to lick”, Copt. logeh id., Ug. lḥk id. (UG, 534), Heb. lāḥak, Syr. lḥk id., CA laḥika id., Cush.: Bed. lak, Som. rak id., Gu. lagā “tongue”, etc.

With š-ext.: Heb. lḥš, Eth. lḥs “to lick”, CA lḥs “to lick with the tongue”, etc.

**3.13.22 Proto-IE-HS stem [lau-] “cease, die”**

IE: OPruss. laut “to die”, Lith. liauti “to cease”; lavonas “corpse”, Russ., dial., luna “death”.

HS: CA lawiy “withering, dry up”; CIV ’alwā “to perish, make dead”.

**3.13.23 Proto-IE-HS stem [lah- or ḥal-] “to pour, wash”**

IE: Hitt. lahuhi “to pour”; lahus “basin”, Grk louō “to wash, bathe”, Lat. lavāre “to wash”. IHL: §36c; IECD, 688; SS: §9.36.

HS: in SL laḥlaḥa, laḥḥa “to wash or bathe by pouring little water (so that the washed object (any object/ fruit/ body, etc.) is neither very dirty nor perfectly clean)”, thus combining the meanings expressed by both Hitt. and Grk-Lat. words, Pun. lḥ “moist” (NWSI I, 570), Heb. lḥh, Eth. lḥ- “be moist” (OT, 518). In CA the root is preserved in laḥḥa “to shed (pour) tears excessively (eyes)”, prob. belong here (by metathesis) Som. ḥal, Ga. halelaa “to wash” (Zaborski, 1975: 328), in NWSI ḥll id. (NWSI I, 375). In Akk., too, ellu “clean”, in Syr. ḥll “to wash”, in CA ḥalla “to dissolve in water”.

**3.13.24 Proto-IE-HS stem [līt- or lait-] “side, edge”**

IE: Lat. lītus “shore”, OE. līste “edge, hem”, OHG. lista id. SS: §1.27.

HS: Egyp. ly’-t “side”, Akk. lētu “cheek”, metaph. for “side” (AG, 85), CA laitū “side of the neck”.

**3.13.25 Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼal-] “strong”**

IE: OE. ellen “strength, valor”, Goth. aljan “zeal”, Lat. alacer “lively”.

HS: Assy. alālu “be strong”; allalū “strong, powerful” (King, 1898: 320), Sab. ’ll in h-’ll-n “to defend, save” (SD, 15).

**3.13.26 Proto-IE-HS word [ga’lab- or ḡlb-] “noise, roar”.**

IE: OE. gielpān “to boast”, ON. ḡalfer “boasting, noise of the sea”, OSax. galpō “cry aloud, boast”, etc. SS: 18.45.

HS: CA galaba-tu “noise, roar, tumult”, Som. jalbeb “conversation”. See §2.11.58 above.

**3.13.27** Proto-IE-HS word [malag] “to milk; milk” and “to suck” in the sense *to take nourishment from the breast by sucking*.

IE: Lat. mulgēre “to milk”, OIr. mligim id., Lith. milžti id., OCS. mlēsti id., OE. milcan, OHG. milchan id.: PIE \*melǵ-. SS: §5.87.

HS: CA malağa “to suck, suckle (infant)”; mulğu “suckling”; malğānu “one who sucks the udder instead of milking it for fear that people hear the noise resulted from milking”: PHS [mal-g-], fr. an ext. of a stem [mal-] seen with or without exts in many words for “milk, to suck” as in Som. mal “milk”, Egyp. mr “milk pot”, CA mlh, mlq, ml’, etc. all have to do with “to suck; milk”.

**3.13.28** Proto-IE-HS word [šalaḥ-] “to send”

IE: OCS. and common Sl. sūlati “to send”, Lat. ex-sulāre “be banished”; ex-sul “exile”; OW. de-ol id. IECD, 1333f, 1139; WP. II, 505, 513.

HS: OAram. šlh “to send, send forth” (AG, 7), Ug. šlh “to send” (UG, 535), Phoen. šlh id. (PG: 150).

**3.13.29** Proto-IE-HS stem [hal-] “to destroy”

IE: Hitt. hullanzi “destroys”, Grk óllūmi “to destroy”, Lat. ab-lēre id., Lith. ālinti “to suppress, starve”. IECD, 871.

HS: Egyp. helle’ “destruction, overthrow”, CA ḥalhala “to shake”; ḥalla “to pierce”; ḥalla-tu “poverty, in want”, Akk. ḥalālu “to pierce”, Phoen. ḥll id. See §2.2.56.2 above.

**3.13.30** Proto-IE-HS word [ḥalaq-] “to perish; bad”

IE: Grk olékō “to destroy”, ON. illr “bad, evil”, fr. Germ. \*ilhila-: OIr. olc “bad”, Lith. alkti “be hungry”, OCS. alŭkati id. SS: §16.72; IECD, 872.

HS: Ug. hlq “to perish” (UG, 534) also “bad” (UG, 531) as in OIr. above, CA ’a-hlaqa “to wear out, perish”; ’ihlaulaqa “to vanish”; ḥalqu “false”.

**3.13.31** Proto-IE-HS word [ḥald-] as n. [ḥuld-] “respect”

IE: Hitt. huldānum, fr. root huld-, “I preserved, respected”.

HS: CA ’u-hallidu “I perpetuate”: ḥuldun “perpetuity”.

**3.13.32** Proto-IE-HS stem [hall-] “valley”

IE: Hitt. hallu- “deep”, Arm. xal “low land”.

HS: CA ḥalla-tu fem. “low-lying land, valley”, Egyp. hry “low-lying land”, Eth. ḳallā “low-lying land, valley”.

**3.13.33** Proto-IE-HS word [ḥaliy-] “bee, beehive”

IE: Skt. ali- “bee”.

HS: CA ḥaliy-yatu fem. “beehive”, Har. illi “purified liquid honey”, Te. wālālā “purified honey”, Som. aulal id. (HED, 24).

### 3.13.34 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḥaul-] “to turn”

IE: Skt. val- “to turn”, Grk eiléo “to revolve, roll”, Hitt. hul- “winding sheet, band”, Lat. volvere “to turn, roll”, Arm. gelum “to twist”, Phryg. wela “turning”. DN, Phryg. G: 141.

HS: CA ḥauwala “to turn, divert, shift, turn aside from”; ta-ḥauwala “to change, alter”, Sab. ḥwl id.; mḥwl “water deflector” = CA muḥauwilu “deflector”, Heb. ḥwl “to turn round, twist, whirl” (OT, 299-300), OffAram. ḥwl “to turn” (NWSI II, 356).

#### Comments

To my understanding, the stem is a cpd of [ḥau-] “turn” and prep. \*-l “to” (CA and gen. Sem. li, ’l “to”): see §2.17.2 above.

### 3.13.35 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḥul-] “pot”

IE: Lat. olla “pot”.

HS: CA ḥulla-tu fem. “cooking pot, pot”, Egypt. ḥr “pot”.

### 3.13.36 Proto-IE-HS word [walaḥ-] “to hit, wound”

IE: Hitt. walahzi “strikes, attacks”, Lat. wulnus “wound”, wellō “to pluck, tear”, OHG. wuol “defeat, pestilence”, OIcel. valr “slaughter”, OPruss. ulint “fight”, Ir. fuil “blood”. Sturtevant (IHL: §361) sees that Hitt. walah- above and hulla- (in §3.13.29 above) are so nearly identical in meaning that it is easy to connect them both with the IE material.

HS: Egypt. wnh “to wound”, CA walaḥa “to hit, stab”. In SL laḥh “to beat, strike”.

3.13.37 Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼal-] “high”. Attention should be paid to an obvious fact that it does make any difference whether you say [ʼal-] or [ʼar-] in IE and HS.

IE: Lat. altus “high”, Gaul. alto id.: Lat. alō “to nourish, support”, OIr. alim “to foster”, Goth. alan “to grow”. SS: §12.31; IECD, 16; 17 WP. I, 86.

HS: Egypt. ’l, Assy. elū “be high; high” (King, 1898: 328), CA ʼālī “high”, Heb. ʼalah “be high, to grow”.

For Lat. alō, etc. above, CA ʼāla “to support, feed, nourish, provide with food”; ʼāʼila “family, supporters, dependants”; OffAram. ʼwyl “child, boy”.

### 3.13.38 Proto-IE-HS word [ʼilqas] “wolf”

IE: Lith. vilkas, Grk lúkos “wolf”, Ved. Skt. vṛkas id., Goth. wolfs, OE. wulf, ON. ulfer id., Lat. lupus id., Hitt. walkuwa “monster”. Meillet, Introd. 357; SS: §3.71; IECD, 1554; WP. I, 316.

HS: CA ʼilḳu “wolf”, derived, according to LA, fr. the adj. ʼilḳa-tu “jumping quickly, bold”. The verbal form is ʼawlaḳa or walaḳa. The word is also seen with initial h- instead of /ʼ/ and with metathesis in haḳlasu (fr. \*hilḳasu) “wolf”. It is also seen in wallāsu “wolf”, fr. \*walkāsu, with complete assimilation of /ḳ/ to preceding /l/ plus suffixal -s-. A fourth variant is ʼaslaḳu (fr. \*ʼilḳasu or \*ʼulḳasu) “wolf”, and a fifth is

ʿawlaḡu “a kind of dog, ogre”, prob. orig. “wolf”, etc., Egyp. wnš (fr. \*wlš) “wolf”, OSA ʿillawšu id., reported by LA.

### 3.13.39 Proto-IE-HS word [ʿail-] “stag”

IE: Ir. elit id., W. elain “doe”, Toch. yāl “gazalle”, Grk élabos “deer”, Lith. elnis, Latv. alnis id., OCS. jelen id., OE. elch “elk”. SS: §3.75; IECD, 238; WP. I, 154.

HS: Akk. ailu “stag”, Ug. ʿyl id., fem. aylt, CA ʿailu, Heb. ʿayyāl, Sab. ʿyl “mountain goat”, Eth. hayyal id. (Gray, 1971: §136; DRS I, 17), Egyp. ʿʿr “stag”.

### 3.13.40 Proto-IE-HS stem [ʿell-] “but, except”

IE: Grk allá, ON. ella, Goth. alja, Alb. ajl “but, yet”. IECD, 15.

HS: CA ʿilla “but, unless, except”, EHeb. ʿlh, Palm. ʿl “but, however” (NWSI I, 57), Mand. ʿala “but, except”, etc. (MD, 350).

### 3.13.41 Proto-IE-HS word [ʿel-] “tree, wood”

IE: Grk ūlē “woods, timber”.

HS: CA ʿalāʿu “a kind of evergreen tree”, Heb. ʿallāh “oak”, ʿēlāh “terebinth” (OT, 53), OAram. ʿlh “leaf, foliage” (NWSI I, 851), Egyp. ʿl, pl., “wooden object, pole”, ʿr, ʿl “terebinth”.

### 3.13.42 Proto-IE-HS word [ʿaliq-] “to shine”

IE: Skt. arc- “to shine”.

HS: CA ʿaliḡa “to shine” also “glitter, radiate”: see §2.1.6.5.10 above.

### 3.13.43 Proto-IE-HS word for “go, leave”

IE: OIr. ad-ella “goes to”, W. el, Corn. ello, Br. yelo “to go”, Grk eláomai “to wander”, ON. elta “to pursue”: PIE \*el-. SS: §10.47; IECD, 13.

HS: either the root in Ug. ḡly “to depart”, CA ḡly “to speed” or the root in CA walla “to go”.

### 3.13.44 Proto-IE-HS word [ʿalisa]

IE: Skt. alasa- “keep still, be quiet, lazy”, fr. Dravidian languages, according to Borrow (SL, 380), Lith. alsus “boring, trying; feeble”. IECD, 722. The morphological structure of the word, as preserved in its CA cognate below, shows that the word cannot be borrowed from Dravidian languages.

HS: CA ʿalisa [lys] “to stay in a place and not move”; ʿalyasu “one who does leave his home”, i.e. “one who stays home”, a cpd of la- “not” and -isa “be, exist, live”.

3.13.45 Proto-IE-HS dial. form [zal-] “to slide, slip” as in CA zalla “to slip”, Syr. zil “to slide”, Kab. zalla “to slip”, Shil. zl id.

IE: With. ḡ-ext.: OCS. slīzûku “slippery”, Russ. slikij id., Bulg. klizati “to slide, slip”, Lith. slīžis “slug, snail”, Ir. sliogaim “to smooch. polish”, IECD, 1213f.

HS: CA zalūġu, zalġu “slippery”; zuluġu “smooth rock”: zalaġa “to slide” also “to run so fast to the extent that the legs can not be seen moving”, Aram. zlg “to flow down”, Berb.: Kab. zeleg “to slip, slide”, Shil. zlg, “to slip”.

IE: With ǵ-ext. Lith. slankus, infixal -n-, “slippery, slim”, OE. slōh “mire, slough”.

HS: CA zaliġa “to slip, slide”; zalġu “slippery, smooth”; Mand. zlh, zLA, zhl “to pour”. Leslau, MD, 168.

IE: With d-ext.: OE. slīdan, Lith. slysti, Latv. slīdēt “to slide”.

HS: CA zaġlaṭa, by metathesis, “to slip”: zalaḥa “to slip”; zulūhu, zaliġu “slippery”.

IE: With p-/b-ext.: OHG. slīfan “to slide, slip”, Sw. slippa, Du. slipper id., OE. slipor “slippery”.

HS: CA zalġafa, zaġlafa “to slide”.

IE: With. m-ext.: OHG. slīmen “to file, smooth”, Ir. sleamhan “slippery, smooth”.

HS: CA zallama “make smooth”.

IE: With ‘b-ext.: Grk leībō “to pour”, Lat. libō “to libate; libation”: PIE \*sleib-. IECD, 1209.

HS: CA zal‘aba “to flow (river, water)”; mu-zla‘ibbu “young of bird whose feathers just begin to grow” ~ mu-zlayibbu id. also “smooth (hair)”, i.e. *slippery*.

### 3.13.46 Proto-IE-HS stem [‘ul-] “this, that”

IE: Lat. ille, illa, *arch.* olle. CG: §306, n. 4.

HS: Akk. ullū “that”.

### 3.14 *PROTO-IE-HS /m/*

Proto-IE-HS /m/ is a bilabial nasal. It is in PIE /m/ and in PHS /m/.

#### 3.14.1 Proto-IE-HS stem [mā] “not”

IE: Grk *mē* “(do) not”, Ved., Skt. *mā*, OPers., Av. *mā*, id., Toch. A *mā*, B *ma* “not”, Alb. *mo-s* “don’t”, Arm. *mi*, Messapian *ma* id., OIr. *mi-* “dis-, un-”. IECD, 738; IEV, 302; WP. I. 236.

HS: Egyp. *m* “not”, CA *mā* id., etc. see §2.21.4 above.

#### 3.14.2 Proto-IE-HS stem [mug-] “child”

IE: Ir. Gaul. *moga* “hermit”, Ir. *mug* “slave, servant”, Cor. *mowes* “maiden”, Goth. *magus* “lad”, ON. *mogr* “boy, son”. CCG: §35.2; SS: §19.42.

HS: Egyp. *mg* “child” (EHD I, 290).

#### 3.14.3 Proto-IE-HS stem [mag-] “great”. For its ult. orig., see §2.2.29 above.

IE: Skt. *mahā-* “great, powerful”, Phryg. *mekas* “great”, Tock. A *māk*, B. *māka* “great in number”, Arm. *mec* “great”. Meillet, Introd. 14.

HS: CA stem [maḡ] occurs in this fixed expression: *laḥmun* (= meat) *mu-maḡmaḡu* “much (meat)”, Ga. *moga* “abundant, plentiful”, Som. *mug* “full”, Sa., Af. *mag* “to fill”.

With r-ext.: CA *maḡru* “very great in number” also “great army”, Shil. *maḡar* “grow bigger”.

#### 3.14.4 Proto-IE-HS stem [mal-] “be many, much, full”

IE: Grk *māla* “much”, Latv. *milns* id., Lat. *maltus* “many”. IER, 40.

HS: Akk. *malū* “full”, CA *malī’u* “full, overcrowded”, Ug. *ml’*, Heb. *māle’*, Eth. *ml’* “full”.

#### 3.14.5 Proto-IE-HS stem [mal-], with various exts, “soft, tender”

IE: Lat. *mollis* “soft”, OIr. *mall* “pliant”, with d-ext.: Skt. *mradas* “softness”, OPers. *mal dai* “young”, OCS. *mladu* “young, tender”, with k-ext.: Grk *malakos* “soft”. IECD, 792; IER, 40; WP. II, 288.

HS: with s-ext. as in Lat. above: CA *mālisu*, ’*amlasu* “soft”; *mulūsa-tu* “softness”, Ge. *mālāsā* “smoothen, polish”, Har. *mōlāsa* “be smooth” (HED, 107);

With d-ext. as in Indo-Iranian and Slavic: CA ’*u-mlūdu* “young, tender”;

With ḡ-ext. (as in Grk above): CA *malaḡa* “to soften”; *malaḡa* “soft, tender”, Tna. *mālākā* “to slip out of the hand”, Har. *mulug bāya* id., etc. (HED, 107);

With k-ext.: CA *malaka* “make fine, tender (knead)”;

With ṭ-ext.: CA *mlṭ* “be smooth, slippery”, BHeb. *mālaṭ* “to smooth, smooth over”, Syr. *mlṭ* “to smooth over”. In Heb. and CA the root also denotes “to shave” (OT, 573), Ge. *mālātā* “strip off, render bare”, Har. *tāmālāta* “be stripped off, fall out (hair)”, etc. (HED, 107).

With ṣ-ext.: BHeb. *mālaṣ* “be smooth”, CA *malaṣa* id. (OT, 578);



With ħ-ext.: CA malīḥu “pleasing, fine”, Ug. mlḥ “beautiful” (UG, 530);  
In addition, CA mlθ “to smooth, soften”, mly, etc.

### 3.14.6 Proto-IE-HS stem [mal-] “mountain”

IE: Illyr. mal- “mountain” also “bank”, Dacian mal- “bank”, Alb. mal “mountain” also “bank”, Skt. maruḥ “mountain, rock”. IECD, 793; WP. II, 285, 295.

HS: Egyp. mr “mountain” also “bank”, Heb. milō “mound, rampart”, *so called as filled in with stones and earth; hence fortress, castle* (OT, 571), Hatra ml’ “artificial terrace” (NWSI II, 628).

With ʔ-ext.: CA miḥātu “summit, peak of a mountain” also “shore”.

Some derivatives of this stem are OE. molda “top of the head” = CA milāṭu “front side of the hump” also “shoulder, forearm” and OE. molde “loose earth” = CA miḥā id.

### 3.14.7 Proto-IE-HS stem [mil-] “cloth, garment”

IE: Lith. milas “cloth”, Grk mallós “of wool”.

HS: CA milā’a-tu fem. “garment, bed-sheet”.

With ħ-ext.: CA milāḥu “something that covers (like garment, etc.), so as to conceal or hide”, Phoen. mlḥ “torn cloth” (PG, 632), BHeb. melaḥ “old clothes, worn out garments” (OT, 573).

### 3.14.8 Proto-IE-HS stem [mal-] “to speak”

IE: Av. mrū- “to speak”, Ir. mellain “I deceive”, Latv. melest “to speak confusedly”, Russ. molvit “to utter”, Cz. mluvit “to speak”. CCG: §26.7; SS: §18.21.

HS: Phoen. mll “to speak, say, utter”, OAram., OffAram., JAram. mll “to speak”; OAram., JAram. mlh “word”, OffAram. mlh ~ mml id., BHeb. mālal in Poet. “to speak”, CA ’amalla, ’a-mālā, ’a-mlaya “to say or read aloud to be written by another”, Ga. malu, Som. malee “to think, suppose”: CA mly also conveys “to think, contemplate”. See §2.3.9 above.

### 3.14.9 Proto-IE-HS word [malah] “to crush, damage, harm”

IE: Lat. molere “to crush”, Toch. B. mely-, mäll-, A maly “to crush, oppress”, Br., Corn. mala “to grind”, W. malu id., OIr. melim “to grind, crush”, Goth. malan id., Lith. malti “to grind, mill”, Arm. malem “I crush”: PIE \*malō-, mel-, etc. IECD, 728, 752, 776; SS: §5.56; WP. II. 285; IER, 40f.

HS: Egyp. mlh “to fight, wage war”, CA malaḥa “to luxate, put out of joint (limbs)”, i.e. *destroy or damage*, also “bite severely”, SL malaḥ, said of *only* of armpit, “put out of joint”, Ge. malḥa “to extirpate”, BHeb. mālaḥ “to rub in pieces, to pulverize” (OT, 572).

### 3.14.10 Proto-IE-HS stem [mal-] “desert”

IE: Goth. malma “sand”, OHG. melm “dust”.

HS: CA malā “desert”; mulā “hot ashes”, Egyp. mr, mrw “desert”, prob. Har. mālu, Ga. molu, Som. mol, Dar. moli-čča “bald” (HED, 107).

**3.14.11** Proto-IE-HS stem [mal-] “exhausted, wretched, worried”

IE: Skt. *mlāna-* “exhausted, languid, withered”, Bulg. *mlitav* “tepid, listless”.

HS: Egyp. *mrwy* “wretched, weak”, CA *mallāla-tu*, *malūlu* “bored, annoyed, worried”: *’a-malla* “to exhaust, wear out (a beast of burden)”; *ta-malmala* “be restless, ill”, Heb. *’umlal* “to languish; languid, feeble”, Mand. *mll* “to crush, hurt, wound, injure”. See §2.3.14 above.

**3.14.12** Proto-IE-HS stem [mun-] “firmness, strength”, related to [man-] below in §3.14.13 and §3.14.15.

IE: Grk *ménos* “courage”.

HS: CA *munna-tu* fem. “strength, might”, Egyp. *mn* “firm, bold”.

**3.14.13** Proto-IE-HS stem [man-] “to think”

IE: Skt. *man-* “to think”; *manas-* “mind”, Av. *man-* “to think”, Goth. *muns* “thought”, Lat. *memini* “I remember”, Grk *mnáomai* id., Lith. *manyti* “to have in mind”, Phryg. *manka* “memorial”, Hitt. *mema-* “to say”; OIr. *menma* “thought, mind”: PIE \**men-*. Meillet, *Introd.* 216; *IECD*, 756; *IHL*: §41b; *WP*. II, 264; *SOE*: §227; *IER*, 41.

HS: Akk. *manû* “to reckon, count”, CA *manna* “to reckon, recite, invent”, OffAram., JAram., Pun. *mny* “to count”, OSA *mny*, Heb. *mnh*, Mand. *mn’* “to reckon, count”, Egyp. *mn* “calculation”; *mnw* “monument”; *mndr* “cerebellum”, Som. *man* “mind”. See §2.16, n. 1 above.

IE-HS words below are related to [man-] above:

3.14.13a IE: Grk *mémōna* “I wish”, W. *mynnu* “to wish”, Br. *mennout* id., OHG. *minna* “love”, Skt. *mana* “desire, envy”.

HS: OAkk. *mny* “to love” (Gelb, 1952: 190), CA *ta-mannā* “to wish for, hope”; *munyah* “a wish”; Soq. *mny* “to desire”, Kab. *menni* “to wish for”, Ge. *tā-männäyā* “to wish”, Tna. *tāmännäyā*, Go., Ms. *tāmenna* id., Har. (tā)männi “a wish”, etc. (HED. 108), Cha.: Fyer *muni*, Sham *mun*, Pero *meno* “love, like” (HSED, 389).

**3.14.14** Proto-IE-HS stem [man-] “to wait for, remain”, related to [man-] “to think”

IE: Av. *man-* “to wait for”, Grk *ménō* “to remain, wait for”, Lat. *manere* “to remain”, Arm. *mnam* id.: PIE \**men-*. *IECD*, 756f; *WP*. II, 267; Meillet, *Introd.* 174; *IER*, 41.

HS: OEgypt. *mn* “to remain”, CA *manā* “to wait for, remain”.

**3.14.15** Proto-IE-HS stem [man-] “man”, ultimately related to [man-] “to think”

IE: Skt. *manu-* “man”, Goth. and common Grm. *manna* id., Toch. A *māññe* “servant, slave”, B. *mañye* id., Phryg. *manēs* id.: PIE \**men-*. *IECD*, 731f; *WP*. II, 266; *IEV*, 51, 74; *IER*, 38,

HS: Akk. and gen. Sem. *-man* “man”: see §2.21.2.2 above.

In addition, CA *mu-mannu* “man of impure stock, bastard”, Heb. *mānōn* “child, offspring”, Sid. *mannō* “man”, Kaf. *manō* “brother”, Egyp. *mn’* “soldier”, with *ḥ-ext.*: *mnḥ* “young man”. See §2.17.61, *Comments* I above.

### 3.14.16 Proto-IE-HS stem [man-] “flaw, defect”

IE: Lat. mendum, menda “physical defect, fault”, mendāx “liar, lying, false”, Skt. mindā- “physical defect”, W. man “spot, mark”, Ir. mind “sign, mark”. IEV, 103; SS: §11.53.

HS: Egyp. mn “be sick or diseased, be weak”, CA manīnu “feeble, weak”; ma-mnūnu “weak; defect”.

Related words are:

3.14.16a Lat. mentīrī “to lie”; mendāx above.

CA ta-mannā “to lie, fabricate lies”.

3.14.16b Lat. Lat. menda, mendum “error in writing”.

CA ta-mannā “make errors in reading” also “know how to read and write”.

As for Celtic mind “mark” above = Egyp. mn-t “mark”.

Finally, W. man also means “place” = Egyp. mn-t “place, abode”, Cush.: Ga. manaa, Som. miin “house”, etc. see §2.3.35 above. All are from [ma] “place”.

### 3.14.17 Proto-IE-HS stem [man-] “collar; neck”, related to \*man- “mountain” below.

IE: Skt. manyā “nape of the neck”, OIr. muinēl “neck”, W. mwn “neck, collar”, Lat. monīle “necklace, collar”, Av. minu- “necklace”, OPers. maniakes id., ON. men, OE. mene id., OCS. monisto id.: PIE \*men-. SS: §4.28; IEV, 103f; IECD, 793; CCG: §3.2; IER, 41.

HS: Akk. maninnu “neck chain” (AG, 87), Egyp. mnḥ “collar, something worn on the neck”, CA manīnu “rope”.

### 3.14.18 Proto-IE-HS stem [man-] “mountain”

IE: Illyr. mento “mountain”, Lat. montis, mōns “mountain”, W. mynydd, Br. menez id., OBr. monid, Cor. meneth “neck”. CCG: §3.2; SS: §1.22

HS: Egyp. mn “mountain”, CA manā-tu “rock” (also a worshipped idol in pre-Islam).

### 3.14.19 Proto-IE-HS stem [man-] “beard, chin”

IE: Lat. mentum “chin”, W. mant “jaw, mouth”, Goth. and common Germ. munps “mouth”: PIE \*men-. SS: §4.209.

HS: Egyp. m’ndw “plaited beard”.

### 3.14.19 Proto-IE-HS stem [man-] “arm”

IE: Lat. manus “hand”, Umb. loc., manuve, Osc. manins “hand”, OHG. munt id.: PIE \*man-, \*men-. Meillet, Introd. 367; IEV, 103; IER, 38.

HS: Egyp. mn “leg, thigh”: see §2.17.72 above.

### 3.14.20 Proto-IE-HS word [mar’-] “man”. *Is it related to [mar-] “to die” as in Egyp. mr “to die”, Skt. mṛ-, Lat. mori id., Hitt. mīrzi “dies”?*

IE: Skt. *martya-* “man, mortal”, *marya-* “young man”, OPers., Av. *martiya-* “man”, Pers., Arm. *mard* id., Lith. *merga* “young girl”, Grk *meĩraks* “boy”: PIE *\*mer-*. IEV, 51; IER, 42; SOE: §227.

HS: CA *mar’u* “man”, Sab. *mr’* “man, lord”, OAram. *mr’* “master”, Egyp. *mr* “brave man”, Akk. *marū* “son, citizen”, Chad.: Gudu *məř* “man”, Nza *mure*, Bata *muřen* id., Cush.: Sid. *mure* “infant”. See §2.17.61 above.

Lith. *marti* “bride, daughter-in-law”, fr. *mar’* above + fem. suffix *-t-* = Akk. *mārtu* “daughter” (AG, 87), CA *mar’atu* “woman, wife”, Sab. *mr’t* “woman, lady” (SD, 87).

#### Comments

To the IE-HS word above *most certainly* belongs Skt. *kumāra-* “boy”; *kumārī-* “girl”. For the initial proot [ku-], see §2.17.83 above.

#### 3.14.21 Proto-IE-HS word [marah-/ḥ] “to destroy, crush, rub”

IE: Skt. *mṛṇati* “crushes”, OHG. *murowi*, *marawi* “tender”, OE. *mearu* id.: PIE *\*mer-eH-*. PIEP: §54.

HS: Egyp. *mrḥ* “to destroy, perish, rub”, Akk. *marahu*, CA *maraha*, *maraha* “to rub”.

#### 3.14.22 Proto-IE-HS stem [mar-] “collection of water, sea”

IE: Lat. *mare* “sea”, OPruss. *mary*, Lith. *marės* id., OCS. *morje* id., Gaul. *more*, W., Br. *mor* id., Goth. *marei* “sea, lake”, OE. *mere* “lake”: PIE *\*mori-*. WP. II, 234; IECD, 731f; IER, 43.

HS: Egyp. *mr* “lake” also “any collection of water”.

3.14.23 Proto-IE-HS word [’urm-] “arm, hand”, perh. related to or variant of [’irab-] in CA *’irabu* a general term for “*an organ of the body*”, but generally applies to “*hand*”.

IE: Skt. *īrmas* “arm”, OPrus. *irmo* id., Lat. *armus* “forequarter, shoulder”, OCS. *ramo* “shoulder”, Goth. and common Germ. *arms* “arm”, Arm. *armuka* “elbow”. SS: §4.31; Meillet, *Introd.* 136; SOE: §217; WP. I, 73.

HS: wrong cognates are CA *rāḥa-tu* “palm of the hand”, Ug. *rḥ* “hand” (UG, 531), etc.

HS: Egyp. *rmn* “arm, shoulder”, *’rmn* “to measure with the hand”, CA *’urramu* “fingertips”, Housa *maarii* “slap” (Parsons, 1975: 424).

It may belong here Har. *mārmār* “shoulder”, Č, En., Gt. *mārmār* “nape of the neck”, Ed., M. *mārmār* “hump of the animal”, Ga. *mormā* “neck” (HED, 111),

#### 3.14.24 Proto-IE-HS word [mara’-] “to see, look”

IE: Lat. *mirari* “to look, wonder at”

HS: Egyp. *mr* (fr. *\*mr’*) “to look at, see”, CA *mara’a* “to look at, wonder at”; *mi-r’ātu* inst. “mirror”.

For the ult. orig. of [mara’-], see §2.10.11 above.

#### 3.14.25 Proto-IE-HS word [mary-] “ox, horse”

IE: Skt. *marya-* “stallion”.

HS: Akk. *māra* “wild ox”, CA *māriy-yatu* “wild cow”, derived from \**mārā* “wild ox”, Egyp. *mr* “cow”.

**3.14.26** Proto-IE-HS word [maraq-] “damage”

IE: Skt. *mṛc-* “to hurt, injure”, Av. *mərəč-* “to destroy”.

HS: OAram. *mrḵ* “destroyer” (AG, 5) also “illness” (NWSI II, 695), CA *marāḳu* “blight, bane”.

**3.14.27** Proto-IE-HS word [marad-] “illness”

IE: Lat. *morbus* “sickness”, *mors* “death”.

HS: OAkk. *mrṣ* “be sick” (Gelb, 1952: 166), CA *marāḏu* “sickness”; *marīḏa* “be sick”, Sab. *mrḏ* “sickness, disease” (SD, 87).

**3.14.29** Proto-IE-HS word [myʰ-] “to go, travel”, a compound of \**ma-* plus \**yaʰ-*. See §3.17.10, *Comments* II below.

IE: Lat. *meāre* “to go, travel”, W. *mont* “to go”, Corn. *mones id.*, OCS. *minati* “to pass (of time)”. SS: §10.47; IER, 40.

HS: Egyp. *myʰ* “to go, travel”, CA *māʰa* “to flow”, Ug. *myy* “to arrive” also “reach” (UG, 530, 535).

**3.14.31** Proto-IE-HS word [maud-] “to wash”

IE: Lith. *maudyti* “to wash”, Latv. *maudāt* “to bathe”, OCS. *myti* “to wash”, MLG. *muten* (fr. Germ. *mauja-*) “to wash the face”. SS: §16.81

HS: CA *māṣa* (fr. *māḏa*) “to wash”; *mauṣu* (\**mauḏu*) “washing”; *mūwāṣa-tu* “dirty water”, Assyr. *miṣū* “wash”, Som. *mayḏa* “to wash”, *maydo* “to bathe, wash”, Ga. *miččín* “to wash”. (Zaborski, 1975: 326). See §2.10.31 above.

**3.14.32** Proto-IE-HS proot [my-], i.e. *mī-* or *mū-* “urine” as a vb *mā-* “urinate”

IE: Skt. *mūtra-* “urine”, OIr. *mūnaim* “to urinate”, *mūn* “urine”, Arm. *mizi*, *mez* “urine”, Av. *mūθra-* “filth, excrement”, also belong here: Germ. MLG., Du. *modder*, etc. “mud”, Grk *múdos* “damp, pus”, *músos* (\**múdsos*) “filth, defilement”, OCS. *myti* “to wash”, etc.: PIE \**meu-*, \**meu-d-*, \**mutros-*, \**mudos* (cf. Grk *múdos*), \**mut(os)-*, etc. IECD, 809f, 823f; WP. II, 228, 249ff; SS: §§1.214, 4.65.

PIE \**mutra-/mutna-* = PHS \**ma-θe-n-*, a cpd of *ma-* “place of”, a proot [θy-] “urine”, and a suffix *-n-*, thus the word meant orig. “place of urine” in the body. In CA the three elements of the compound were blended together to give rise to the triliteral /mθn/: *maθāna-tu*, as defined by LA, “place of urine”, i.e. *urinary bladder*, with verbs *maθana*, *ʾamθana*, etc. The IE-HS proot [θai] is also preserved in Ug. *θyn* “urinate; urine”, etc. See §2.10.19 above, and a variant *maḏyu*, *maḏiy* “sperm, semen (of male)”, while that of woman is *strangely* called *ḳaḏiy*. Both [ma-] and [ḳa-] are proots, and for [ḳa-] see §2.17.83 above. To the fem. form one may add *-r*, etc.: *ḳaḏār* “filth”.

The reconstructed PIE \**meu-* corresponds neatly to Egyp. *mwí-t* “urine”. However, the Egyp. word is from. *mwí* “water”. In accordance with this fact, the only form that

can explain the differences with regard to the phonological structure of the cpd word among the IE words above is that of CA.

**3.14.33** Proto-IE-HS word [vb. mauw-, n. mū-]

IE: OE. māwan “to reap, mow”, OHG. māen id. IER, 39.

HS: Egyp. my “to reap”, Sab. mwn “provisions, food”, CA mūna-tu “food, provisions (of what the earth produces, e.g. *grain*, fruit, etc.), collected at the time of harvest and preserved for consumption until the next harvest”.

**3.14.34** Proto-IE-HS word [maiθ-] “gentle, lovely, pleasant”

IE: Ir. mōith “tender”, Lith. mielas “dear”, OCS. mio “love”, Lat. mītis “gentle, soft, mild”, Skt. mayas- “joy, delight”. PIE \*mei-. SS: 16.27; IECD, 746; WP. II, 238, 247; IER, 40.

HS: Egyp. myw “gentleness”, Ga. mia “sweet”, CA maiθu, ’imtiyāθu “welfare and happiness”; mayθā’u “pleasant (hill)”, Sab. myθ “wine” (SD, 89); with s-ext.: CA maisūnu “beautiful, lovely”; maisānu “full moon”.

**3.14.35** Proto-IE-HS word [ma’al/-r-] “be bald”

IE: OIr. mael “bald”, NIr. maol, W. moel, Br. moal id.

HS: CA ma’aru “bald”: ma’ara used only with *hair* “to drop, fall off”. The root is from ’āri “naked” (§2.10.35 above) and, therefore, it may not be cognate.

Since the OIr. word above also means ‘without horn’, and W. mail “mutilated”, it is most likely that the Celtic word is a cpd of [ma] “not” (§3.14.1 above) and [’il or ’al] “horn” as in CA mi-’allu inst. id.

A word ma’al exists in CA and signifies “castrate”. Its possible that [-’al-] = “male” (CA ’ul’ul) and \*ma- = either “testicle” (Egyp. m’-tí pl.) or “no”. Suppose that \*ma- = “cut”, it will be an old variant of [ba-].

**3.14.36** Proto-IE-HS stem [mu’-] “sign”

IE: Lith. moti “make a sign, beckon”, OCS. na-majati “beckon to”, Russ. na-majat “let know by sign, deceive”: Skt. māyā- “trick, deceit, fraud”.

HS: CA ma’inna-tu fem. “sign”: ma’ana “let know”.

*Comments*

If the data set forth above is left without explanation, one may derive the conviction that Skt. and Balto-Slavic words are not cognates or (in case if they are) the CA given word is an erroneous cognate.

Skt. māyā- above is cognate with CA ma’yu “calumny, slander” and the basic meaning is “to deceive others in order to spoil their friendly relationship” as a vb ma’ā. From this stem a large number of roots have developed: myn “lie”, m’s, m’θ, etc. = ma’yu above.

The Slavic [na-] above = CA [na-] in namīma-tu fem. = ma’yu above in meaning, as a vb namma = ma’ā in meaning. This *namma* is obviously from *namaya*. According to Aṣma’i, *namay-tu Hadith* (-tu = I) “I relate Hadith in a slanderous manner”. The very

same proot [n-] can freely occur in final position, hence a new trilateral [myn] as in CA maynu “lie” as a vb māna arch. “to lie, fabricates lies” for the purpose of ‘deception’. This particular type of ‘deception’ demands ‘knowledge’; *one knows what he is doing, the purpose for doing it, and the result to be achieved*. In brief, he uses his creative mind in *ma’a*.

All words above, together with those in §3.14.16 above are absolutely from a proot [mai].

### 3.14.37 Proto-IE-HS word [māh-r/n- or maih-r/n-] “month, moon”

IE: Skt. māti “measures”; mā-trām “a measure” Lat. mētīrī “to measure”, Hitt. mehur “time, point of time”, Goth. māl “time”; with suffixed forms: Goth. and common Germ. mēna “moon”, Lith. mėnuo id.; Lat. mēnsis “month”, Skt. mās- id., Grk mēn id. **IHL:** §46b; SS: §1.53; SOE: §227.

HS: Egyp. mḥy’ “to measure, weigh”; mḥ’r *month* of Mekir, prob. Som. mar “time”.

Skt. mās above and CA maisā-nu “full moon, i.e. 14<sup>th</sup> night of the month” are formed directly from [mai-] “measure”.

### 3.14.38 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḥum-] “sickness, fever”

IE: Skt. amatah “disease”, amīvā “suffering”, Grk Hom. omoiios “horrible, death”.

HS: CA ḥummatu “fever” also “poison”; ḥimāmu “death”, Egyp. ḥm’w “illness, disease”, Tham. ḥmm “to suffer from a fever”, Heb. ḥēmah “poison”.

To the stem belong ON. ama, etc. “vex, annoy” = Egyp. ḥmh “anxiety”, CA ḥumaiyā “anger”; ḥamiya “be angry”, Heb. ḥmh “wrath, anger”, OffAram. ḥmh “wrath” (NWSI I, 381).

### 3.14.39 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḥam-] “strength, power”

IE: Av. amō “strength, power”, Skt. am- “to press on, injure”; amah “strength”: PIE \*om-, \*omō. IECD, 873f; SS: §4.81; WP. I. 187.

HS: CA ḥamā “to protect, defend”, ḥamiyya-tu fem. Sab. ḥmy “to protect, guard; protector” (SD, 69), Tham. ḥm’ “protection” (Branden, 1950: 514), Phoen. ḥmyt “fence, wall (as a means of protection)”, Moab. ḥmt “fortress, wall” (WSI. P. 90), perh. Egyp. ḥm, ḥmḥm “to rub down, crush”.

### 3.14.40 Proto-IE-HS stem [’am-] “to seize”

IE: Lat. emere “to take, buy”, Umb. emps “taken”, Lith. imti “to take”, OPruss. imt id., OCz. jmam “to have”. Mann (IECD, 240) connects these words with Arm. imanam “to understand”, Toch. ime “thought”.

Concerning Mann’s view, Arm. and Toch. words are from a caus. stem ’am- “to understand, think, know” as in Egyp. ’m “to know, understand” (§§2.3.7-8 above). As for other IE words, they may be cognates with Egyp. ’m “to seize, to grasp”, Chad.: Housa am “to seize”, Tera ōom, Musgum ima, imi “to catch, seize”, Kabalay am “to catch”, Lele ōm id. (HSED, n. 35).

### 3.14.41 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḥam-] “skill, craft”

IE: Lith. *āmata* “craft, skill”, Latv. *amast* id., Skt. *amatih* “form, shape, beauty”.

HS: Egyp. *ḥm* “be skilled”; *ḥmw* “handicraftsman, skilled laborer”, perh. CA *ḥammatu* “the best (of anything), beautiful”.

**3.14.42** Proto-IE-HS stem [hām-] “raw; ignorant, untrained”

IE: Skt. *āma* “raw”, Grk *ōmós* id., Arm. *hum* id.

HS: CA *hāmu* “raw” also crude”, Egyp. *ḥm* “ignorant, untrained”.

**3.14.43** Proto-IE-HS stem [ham-] “to think”

IE: OCS. *umû* “mind”, Bulg., Russ. *um* id.

HS: Egyp. *ḥmt* “to think, observe, think out a matter”, CA *hammana* “to guess; assume”, Kab. *hamem* “to think”, Shil. *hamim* “to consider” (§2.16, n. 1). Otherwise, see §3.14.40 above.

**3.14.44** Proto-IE-HS word [ḥamid-] “sour, acid”

IE: Skt. *amlas* “acid, sour”.

HS: CA *ḥamidu* “sour, acid”, Ug. *ḥmṣ* “vinegar” (UG, 637), Heb. *ḥāmēš* “be sour, sharp, acid” (OT, 325).

**3.14.45** Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼum-] “forearm, shoulder, elbow”

IE: Grk *ōmos* “shoulder”, Lat. *umerus* id.

HS: Egyp. *ʼm* “forearm”, Sem. *\*ʼm-* “forearm, elbow”: Akk. *amma-tu*, Heb. *ʼammā*, Ug. *am-t*, Syr. *ʼama*, Mand. *ama*, SA, Eth. *ʼm-t*, etc. (DRS I, 23), CA *ʼumma-tu* “stature and face”.

**3.14.46** Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼəm-] “eye, to see”

IE: Grk *ōmma* “eye”.

HS: Egyp. *ʼm* “to see”. *ʼmm* “eye”.

**3.14.47** Proto-IE-HS word [ʼamma-t-] “paternal aunt”; [ʼamm-] “paternal uncle”, as in CA *ʼammu*, Sab. *ʼmm* (SD, 16).

IE: Lat. *amita* “aunt”, Grk *ammá*, Alb. *amë* “mother”, Toch. B *amma* id., ON. *amma* “grandmother”, OFris. *amma* id., OHG. *amma* “mother, nurse”. IECD, 18; WP. I, 53.

HS: CA *ʼammatu* “aunt”, Akk. *ammum* “paternal aunt”.

**3.14.48** Proto-IE-HS *\*(ʼu)ma-(t-)* “mother”

IE: Skt. *mātā* “mother”, Latv. *māte* id., OCS. *mati* id., Arm. *mayr*, Toch. *amacar* id. Meillet, Introd. 350.

HS: Egyp. *mt* “mother”, Akk. *ummu*, CA *ʼummu* id.

**3.14.49** Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼam-] “that, this”

IE: Skt. *ama-* “this one” occurred in one ritual phrase, OPers. *amata* “from there”, perh. Ved. *amā* “at home”. SL, 274.

HS: Assy. *ammu* “that”, Afar *ama* “this”, etc. O’Leary, 1969: §94.



**3.14.50** Proto-IE-HS stem [mat-] “to see”, this perh. one of the most ancient stem based on mę- “eye”.

IE: Lith. matyti “to see”, Latv. matīt “to feel, perceive”. SS: §15.51.

HS: Egyp. mtmt “to pry into”, perh. CA *arch.* maumūtu “known”: ’amata, with caus. /’a-/, “to guess, estimate + to doubt”. On the other hand, mataš ~ madaš “weak vision”.

It seems to me that \*mę- “eye” is also the term for ‘mind’, as well as “to know, to measure; to speak, etc.”.

**3.14.51** Proto-IE-HS stem [mat-] “serpent, worm”

IE: Goth., OE. maþa “worm”, OHG. mado id.

HS: Egyp. mtmt “a serpent-god”.

### 3.15 *PROTO-IE-HS /n/*

Proto-IE-HS /n/ is a dental nasal. It is in PIE /n/ and in PHS /n/

#### 3.15.1 Proto-IE-HS proot [na-, ni-] “not”

IE: Grk *nē-* “not”, Skt., Av. *na*, OCS. *ne*, Lith. *ne* id., Goth. *ni*, OE. *ne*, *nā-*, ON. *ne*, OHG. *ne*, *ni* “not”, Lat. *ne-* as in *nullus* “none” (*ne-* “not” and *ūllus* “any”), Mlr., W. *ni*, Corn. *ny*, Br. *ne* “not”. CCG: §72; IECD, 829; IER, 43f.

HS: Egyp. *n*, *n'*, *nn*, *nt* “not”, CA 'in (*-ni*), Ug. 'n, etc. id. (§2.21.3 above).

#### 3.15.2 Proto-IE-HS stem [nam-] “mistake, blemish”

IE: W. *nam* “blemish, fault”, Br. *namm* “blame, stain, vice”, Cor. *nam* “flaw”, Av. *nəmō* “guilt”. IECD, 826.

HS: Egyp. *nm* “mistake, error, mean, abased” as v. “do evil”, CA *numā* “blemish, disgrace”.

#### 3.15.3 Proto-IE-HS stem [naw-] “to observe, see”

IE: Grk *noéo* “to perceive, notice, think”.

HS: Egyp. *nw* “to observe, see”, Eth. *nawâ* “behold”, CA *nawā* “to intend”, Kab. *nuu* “to believe”, PChad. \*n- “to see”. See §2.8.22, n. 8 above.

#### 3.15.4 Proto-IE-HS stem [na'- or nai'-] “to guard, watch”

IE: Skt. *nī-*, *ni-* “to lead”, Av., OPers. *nī-* id., Hitt. *na-a-i* “to lead, send, turn”: Skt. *netar-* “to guard”: OIr. *neath* “hero”: PIE \**nei-*. SS: §10.64; IER, 44; IH \**ne'y-*. HCG, §77.

HS: Egyp. *nw'* “to keep guard over, watch”: *nww* “guide, leader”, Assy. *nē'u* “to restrain, hinder, stop”, CA 'ista-n'a Class X of *na'ā*, “to look at”: *nāwa'a* “to withstand, rise, oppose”, Heb. *nw'* “to hinder”. See §2.8.22, esp. n. 1 and 3 above.

#### 3.15.5 Proto-IE-HS word [nau-t-, nū-t-] “sailor, ship, boat”

IE: Grk *naútēs* “sailor”, Lat. *nauta* id., Lat. *nāvis* “ship”, Grk *naūs* “boat”, Skt. *nāuh* id., OPers. *nāv-* id., Toch. *new-* id., Arm. *naw* id., OIr. *nau*, *no* “ship”, Gaul. *noe* id., ON. *naust* “boat-house”: PIE \**nāu-*. CCG: §13.3; WP. II. 315; IECD: 828; SS: §; Meillet, *Introd.* 362; IER, 43.

HS: Egyp. *n'-t* (fr. \**nw'-t*) “sailing ship” = Ug. *anyt* (fr. \**nwt*) “ship” (UG, 535), CA *nūtī* [*nwt*] “sailor”: *nāta* “to sway, swing from side to side”: PHS \**nw-* “to sail, move to and fro” as in Egyp. *n'* “to sail” = CA *nawa'a*, *nā'a* “to move to and fro, be moved by the wind, sway”, Ug. *nw'* “to move”.

#### 3.15.6 Proto-IE-HS word [namā- or nawā-] “dwelling, pasture”

IE: Ved. *namah* “pasture”, Grk *nomōs* “pasture, abode”, Lith. *namaĩ* “house”, Latv. *names* id., *nemus* id., Gaul. *nemeto-* “sacred grove”. IECD, 851.

HS: Akk. *namū*, *nāwu* “pasture”, Aram. *nawītā* “pasture”, ESA *nwy* “pasture, meadow”, Heb. *nāwe* “pasture, grass-land” (Tyloch, 1975, 58), *nāwā* “a dwelling”.

habitation, home” (OT, 656), CA nawā “house, habitation, dwelling”. See §2.8.22, n. 5 above.

### 3.15.7 Proto-IE-HS stem [nas-] “to approach”

IE: Skt. *nase* “to approach”, Hitt. *neš* “to turn”, Grk *néomai* “to return”, Ionic *nīsomai* id., Goth. *nasjan* “to save, rescue”, OE. *nerian* id., *ge-nesan*, Goth. *ga-nisan* “to survive”, OFris. *nera* id., Toch. A *nas*, B *nes* “to be”. IECD, 839; WP. II, 334. Grm and Tock. may not be related to others.

HS: Egyp. *ns* “to approach, arrive”.

### 3.15.8 Proto-IE-HS word [nai'-] “good, pleasant”

IE: OIr. *niam* “brilliance”, OPers. *naiba* “good”, also “beautiful”, Lat. *nitēre* “to shine, glitter”: PIE \**nei-*. IER, 44.

HS: Egyp. *ny'n* “good”, CA *nā'imu* “fine, pleasing, soft, agreeable”: *na'ima* “be soft, smooth, pleasant” also “live in comfort and luxury”; *ta-na'ama* “lead an easy and luxurious life”, Sab. *n'm* “be favorable, prosperous” as vb “to agree, consent” (SD, 90), Phoen., Pun. *n'm* “good, agreeable, favorable; pleasure” (NWSI, II, 738-789), Heb. *n'm* “sweet, pleasant”.

### 3.15.9 Proto-IE-HS stem [nah-] “to fear”

IE: Hitt. *nahmi* “I fear”, Ir. *nār* “bashful”. IHL: §17a; PIEP: §3.4.

HS: Egyp. *nnh* “be terrified”, Som. *naḥ* “be afraid”, Ga. *naa* id. (Zaborski, 1975: 328): CA *nahā*, *nahnaha* “to forbid”.

3.15.10 Proto-IE-HS word [sanīḥ-] “thread, rope, string”, ult. consisting of [sa-], proot [nau-] “bind”, and [-ḥ-]. The word has already been studied in §3.9.17 above.

IE: OCS. *nitī* “thread”, Grk *nēma* “thread”, Ir. *snāthe*, Br. *neud* id.

With r-ext.: Toch. B. *ṣṇaur* “nerve”, *ñare* “thread”, Grk *neūron* “sinew, bowstring”, Lat. *nervus* “string of instrument, nerve”, OE. *snēr* “string of instrument”.

With various exts: Grk *nēthō* “spin-thread”, OIceld. *snælda* “spindle”; Ir. *snāth* “thread”, W. *noden* pl. id., etc. PIE \*(s)nē-, (s)nēi-; Skt. *snāyāmi* “spin-thread”, Latv. *snāt* “twisted”, etc. SS: §6.38; IECD, 1235 ff, WP II. 696.

HS: CA *sanīḥu* “a kind of thread”, Egyp. *snḥ* “band, fillet”, developed fr. a root \**nw-* as in Egyp. *nw* “thread, cord, rope” as v. “to tie, bind together”, with ḥ-ext.: *nwh* “rope, cord, string” also “to tie”, Chad.: Bokkos, Sha no' “to tie” (HSED, n. 1880).

### 3.15.11 Proto-IE-HS stem [nah-] “calamity”

IE: Ir. *nuna* “hunger”, W. *niwed* “harm”, Cz. *nyvy* “languishing”, Arm. *nvam* “to lament”. IECD: 855.

HS: Egyp. *nh(w)* “loss, disaster, calamity”; *nhw* “those who suffer, the indigent, the destitute”.

### 3.15.12 Proto-IE-HS stem [ʾan-] “to breathe”

IE: Skt. aniti “breathes”; anilah “wind”, Grk ánemos “wind”, Av. ānti- “inhalation” Goth. anan “to breathe”, ON. anda id., Lat. anima “breath”, OIr. anāl id., W. anadl: PIE: \*anō-. IECED: 26f; WP. I, 56; Meillet, Introd. 228; CCG: §2.

HS: Akk. anāhu “to breathe with difficulty, sigh”, Ug. ’nh “to sigh”, Heb. ’nh id., CA ’anaḥa “to sigh, exhale, heave” (DRS, I, 24-25): PHS [’an-ḥ-], fr. an ext. of a stem \*’an- seen, with many exts, in words for “breathe”: See §2.11.90, under *Comments* above.

Related words are:

3.15.12a IE: Lat. animal “living creatures”, animus, anima “breath, soul”, Grk ánemos, Skt. ananam, Toch. āñm id., OIr. anim, Br. anaon “souls”: PIE \*anō-. SS: §16.11; IECED, 22; WP. I, 57.

HS: CA ’anāmu “creatures, mankind”, SA ’nm “mankind, inhabitants”, Syr. ’nm’ “army, Egyp. ’nmw “human beings”, Ga. namaa “man”, Som. nin, (Zobrascki, 1975: 325).

3.15.12b IE: Grk annis “grandmother”, Lith. anyta “husband’s wife”, OHG. ana “grandmother”, Lat. anus “old woman”. IECED: 21; WP. I, 55; IEV, 37.

HS: CA ’ānisa-tu “young unmarried woman”, contrasting with ’ānisu “old unmarried woman”, Egyp. ’ns-d “title of a priestess”, with θ-ext.: Akk. aššatu (\*’anš-tu) “wife, woman” (AG: 67), CA ’unṯa “female”, OAram. ’nt “woman, female” (AG: 8): Har. anna “paternal aunt”, Arg. anna, S. anāt, W. anat, Ms. annat, etc. id., Cush.: Sa., Af. annā “aunt” (HED, 27).

**3.15.13** Proto-IE-HS word [’an’ar-] “man”, a compound of [’an-] and [’ar-] “man”. To this compound belong such derivatives as OIr. nert “strength” and Egyp. ner “be strong, mighty”.

The entire IE & HS languages have lost the initial glottal stop /ʔ-/ and, with the exception of Grk and Phryg., a visible reflex of its former presence. Grk has also retained a reflex of /ʔ/.

IE: Grk anēr (fr. \*an-ēr, i.e. \*’an-’er-) “man”, Phryg. anar id., Osc.-Umb. ner- “men of rank, officials”, Skr. nar- “man, warrior”, Av. nar- “man”, Alb. njeri id, OBr. ner “lord”: PIE \*ner-. SS: §2.21; IECED: 21f; IER, 44.

HS: Egyp. n’rn “young soldier”, with loss of / ʔ /, nr-t, pl., “man”, Ug. n’r “boy, child” (UG, 531), Phoen. n’r “young man, youth”, (PG, 124), Heb. na’ar “boy” (OT, 679), CA nu’ara-tu “child”, Ga. nao “soldier”.

I have analyzed the word in §2.11.48 above as being based on [’ar-] without determining the meaning or function of /n-].

a) Initial /ʔan-/ could be related to [n-] in §2.11, n. 6 above.

b) Stem [’ar] is a cpd of [’a-] (see §2.14 above) and [ra-] “man” as in Egyp. r “man”, rt id. (§3.6.45 above).

**3.15.14** Proto-IE-HS word for “now” prob. was \*’anan-, fr. a root \*’n-n/w- as in Egyp. nw “time”, CA ’inwu, ’innā, etc. “time”.

IE: Skt. *nūnam-* “now”, Grk *vūv* id., Lat. *nunc* id., OCS. *nynê*, OE. *nū* and common Grm. id. SOE, §228.

HS: Akk. *inannu* “now” (AG: 79), Assy. *eninna*, *inannu* id., CA *’al’āna* “now”, a compound of *’al* “this” and *’ānu* “time”: see §2.22, n. 5 above.

### 3.15.15 Proto-IE-HS stem [’an-] “toward, to, after”

IE: Skt. *anu-* “toward, along, after”, Av. *anu-*, Grk *aná-*, OPers. *anu*. SS: §2.85.

HS: Akk. *ana* “to” (AG, 66), Egyp. *’n* “to”, CA *’anna* “after” but in the ancient dialects of Tamim, Qais, Asad, etc. /’/ > /’/: *’anna* “after”.

### 3.15.16 Proto-IE-HS stem [’an-] “on”

IE: OE. *an* “on”, OHG. *ana* id., ON. *ā* “on, in”, Grk *ana* “on, up, at the rate of”. IER, 2.

HS: CA *’an* “on, off, from”.

### 3.15.17 Proto-IE-HS proot [’in-] “in”

IE: Grk *én* “in”, Lat. *in* id., Osc-Umb. *-en* id., Goth., OE., OHG. *in* “in”, OIr., OBr. *en*, *eín* id., Toch. *in-* id., OPruss. *en*, Arm. *i* id. IECD, 241; WP. I, 125.

HS: Akk. *in* “in”, Assy. *in* “in, through” (King, 1898: 334), Egyp. *’n* “in”, Eth. *’nta*, Tigre *’et* id. (O’Leary, 1969: 269).

### 3.15.18 Proto-IE-HS word [’ind- or ’and-] “into, in, inside”

IE: Hitt. *anda* adv. “inside”, Lyc. *âte* adv. “within”, Grk *éndon* “into, in”, OLat. *endo*, Mlr. *in* “into”. IECD, 241.

HS: CA *’inda* (*arch.* *’anda*, *’unda*) “at, in, near, on”.

### 3.15.19 Proto-IE-HS stem [’in] “not”

IE: Lat. *in-* “not”, as in *infirmus* neg. of *firmus* “solid, strong”, OIr. *an-*, Ved. *an-* id.

HS: Egyp. *’n* “not”, CA *’in*, Ge. *’en-* “not”, in such forms as *’en-da’i* “I don’t know”, *’enbala* “without” (O’Leary, 1969: 274), Ga. *in-* “not” as in *in-siku* “immoveable”: *sika* (v, n) “move”, Har. *innē* “no” (HED: 27).

### 3.15.20 Proto-IE-HS proot [’au- or ’au-] “one, first”

IE: OLat. *oino(m)* “one”, Grk *óine*, Lith. *vienas* id., OPruss. *ains*, Goth. *ains* id., Ir. *oin*, *oen*, W., Cor. *un*, Br. *unam* id., Skt. *ēnam* “him”. CCG: §15;

HS: Egyp. *’* “one”, w’ id., Berb.: Kab. *iun*, Shil. *ian* “one”, Cush.: Som. *uun* “only”.

CA *’aunu* “once in the past” (see §2.12.18 above); *’auna-tu* fem. perh. “*lonely* (lit. orphan) heap of sand”.

There is a good possibility that [-n] of *’aunu* is a cpd of [’au-] “one, once” and [-n] “before in time”. See §2.17.37 above.

With k-ext.: *’auku* lit. “the *first thing/one* to see, meet, etc. before anything else”.

## Comments I

As has already been mentioned (§3.7.18 above), medial and final /r/ is either a proot or affix. If this is a genuine fact, we should expect it *sometimes* to work in a reversal manner, i.e. *it can also be infix in a word to modify its meaning*. Take, for example, CA 'aunu "above" and infix /-r-/ in it, the resulting word is pronounced 'irnīn = *the first of anything*. Take the next word 'auku and infix an /-r-/, the outcome is a word pronounced 'arka-tu fem. "once" = Skr. eka "one", etc.<sup>311</sup> As one may note, the meanings expressed by ['wn] and ['rn] are different; this difference stems from the /n/ of each word and not from the addition of /-r/ to ['au-]: see below.

All words in the foregoing paragraph are from a proot ['au- ~ 'au] "one, first" as in Egyp. ' "one", CA 'aw-l "first, etc.": see §2.17.15 above.

The /-r-/ of 'arka-tu above may be from /-w-/, i.e. from 'auku or 'awku ['wk] (for this type of interchange, see §2.15, n. 1 above) or from 'akka "repeat (the same thing, e.g. utterance) one, two, and three times", where the 1<sup>st</sup> /-k-/ dissimilates to /-r-/. It should be remembered here that the basic meaning of 'araka is "to repeat".

### Comments II

We have already seen that CA once had a very complicated numeral system including numbers for 'one, two, three, etc. of a kind', and that only some of such numbers have been kept. It is to this system belongs the special term 'auna-tu fem. "one of two" or "one of a pair of". This word is not the same as 'aina-tu fem. id., from 'ainu "eye".

#### 3.15.21 Proto-IE-HS stem ['an-] "that, this"

IE: Ved. anā- Skt. ana-, OPers. anā, Av. ana, Arm. na, etc. PIE \*ons, \*anos "that, yon", according to IECD: 879.

HS: Assy. annu "this", Heb. hēn id., Sab. hn id. CA han- masc. "this"; han-tāh fem., fr. 'anna, etc. O'Leaty, 1969: §93.

#### 3.15.22 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḥan-] "lady"

IE: Hitt. hannas "grandmother", Lyc. hnna id., OHG. ana id., Arm. han id., Alb. nânë, Lat. anus. PIEP: §3.4; IHL: §22a.

HS: Egyp. ḥn-t "lady", CA ḥanna-tu arch. "wife".

3.15.23 Proto-IE-HS word ['ang-] "to bend, be crooked", ult. fr. a proot ['au-] (see 2.1.14.3, n. 4 above); [-n-] is an infix: CA 'āḡ "tusk (of elephant), back (of turtle)"; 'auḡā "bow (weapon)" (= Toch. aṇcal id., etc.) as a vb "be crooked, to bend", Heb. 'wg "move in a circle" (OT, 754) ~ ḥwg id. (OT, 298). The addition of /-n-/ does not affect the basic meaning: CA 'anaḡa "to turn round, twist". Prefixing proot [ḡa-] to ['au] gives rise to CA ḡa'wu "hook". For proot [ḡa-], see §2.17.83 above.

IE: Skt. āñc- "to bend"; āñka- "bend, hook", Lat. uncus "hook", Grk agkōn "elbow"; agkúlos "hook", Toch. A āṇkar- "tooth, tusk", OE. eagan "throat, gorge, abyss", Gaul. anku- "bent", OBr. ankou "death". IECD, 26; SS: §9:14.

<sup>311</sup> Infixing /r/ in a word like CA ḥāfa-tu fem. "edge" will give rise to ḥarfu masc. id., etc. see §2.15.29 above.

### 3.15.24 Proto-IE-HS word [ʼang-] “nail”

IE: Lat. *unguis* “nail, hoof, claw”, Grk *anux* “nail”, OHG. *nagal* id., OIr. *ingen* “(finger-) nail”, OW. *eguin*, OCor. *euuin* id. CCG: §37.4; IER, 45.

HS: OEgy. *ʼgy-t* “nail, hoof, claw”, CA *ʼināḡu* “ear of a bucket or pail”: *ʼanaḡa* “to twist, turn, bend”.

### 3.15.25 Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼən-] “sin”

IE: Skt. *enas-* “sin, evil deed”, Av. *aēnah-* id.

HS: Assy. *annu* “sin, error, wickedness; transgression, fault” (King, 1898: 322), perh. CA *ma-ʼnūnu arch.* “idiot”. Also belong here with different exts: CA *ʼnḡ* in *ʼindiyānu* “evil, wrongdoer”, *ʼanita* “be sinful, guilty”, etc.

### 3.15.26 Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼan-] “to scold, blame”, derived fr. [ʼan-] “oppress, subdue” above (§3.15.29 below).

IE: Grk *ónomai* “to scold, blame”, Ir. *anim* “blemish, flaw”, W. *anaf* “blemish, defect”

HS: CA *ʼunfu* “force, violence”: *ʼannafa* “scold, to reprimand, blame”; *ʼiʼtanafa* “be ignorant of, stupid”, Som. *ʼanaano* “to scold”.

In CA *ʼanamu* has a basic meaning “red” (red tree, tree/plant with red fruit/flower, red cheek), prob, orig. “wound or blood from a wound”: cf. W. *anaf* also means “wound”.

### 3.15.27 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḡaug-, ḡāḡ-] “necessity, need”

IE: with infixed *\*-n-*: Grk *anáḡke* “need, necessity”, OIr. *ēcen*, W. *angen* id., Hitt. *henk* “to fix, fasten, assign, devote”; *henkan* “fate, death, pestilence”. IHL: §47e; SS: §9.93.

HS: CA *ḡāḡa-tu* “need, necessity, want”; *ʼiḡtāḡa* “to need, want, be in need of”; *ta-ḡāḡḡā* “to commit oneself to, stick to”.

### 3.15.28 Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼain-] “eye; to see”

IE: Av. *vaēn-* “to see”, OPers. *vain-* id.

HS: Akk. *īnu* “eye”, Heb. *ʼayin* id., Ug. *ʼyn* “to see; eye”, CA *ʼainu* “eye”; *ʼāyana* “to inspect, see”, Eth. *ʼayn* “eye”.

Here belong Br. *eienenn* “spring, well” = CA nom. sg. *ʼainun* “spring, well”, Ug. *ʼn* “spring” (UG, 537), Phoen. *ʼn* id. (PG, 132).

### 3.15.29 Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼan-] “to oppress, subdue”

IE: Skt. *in-* “to force, oppress, press”, Av. *inti-* “pain, violence, torment”: *in-* “to give pain to, overcome”, Grk *aínumai* “to seize, take”.

HS: Phoen., JArām. *ʼn* “to subdue, oppress” (NWSI, II, 876), Heb. *ʼnh* “to suffer, oppress, afflict, humble” (OT, 801), Assy. *enū* “to overcome, humble” (King, 1898: 330), Sab. *ʼnw* “be distressed, troubled” (SD, 17), CA *ʼāna* “to suffer”; *ʼanā* “to take by force, subdue”.

**3.15.30** Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼan-] “to work hard, toil”, related to [ʼan-] above “oppress, subdue”.

IE: Hitt. ann-anumi “to train, make, do”, Myc. onato “obligation”, Lith. anuoju- “to do”, Goth. annō “salary, grant”, OE. an “grant”, ON. ann id.; annt “hard-working, busy”, annar gen. sg. “work, business”. IECD, 878.

HS: Egyp. ʼnwt- “a class of foreign workmen”, CA ʼanaya, ʼanā “to drudge, toil, work hard, exert oneself”; yu-ʼānūna arch. “look after” (= ON. annast, reflex., id.: cf. Mann, ibid.), occurred in the old saying: «yu ʼānūna mālahum» (LA); ʼi-ʼtanā “to heed, take care of”, Heb. ʼānā “to bestow labor upon, to exercise oneself in anything, to labor and toil” (OT, 800-801),

To this root also belong, among others, Lat. onus “load, task, obligation” and CA ʼanāʼu “drudgery, toil, trial, adversary, pains”.

**3.15.31** Proto-IE-HS stem [ʁ3n-] “pretty, gracious”

IE: Skt. antah “lovely”, Goth. ansts “joy, grace, favor”, OE. ēst “pleasure, love, grace, joy”, Alb. ândë “desire”. IECD: 880.

HS: Egyp. ʼn “be pretty, beautiful, gracious, pleasant”; ʼn-t “a beautiful goddess or woman”, CA ʁāniya-tu “a beautiful woman”; ʁanāʼu “profit or gain”; ʁinā “satisfaction, content, wealth, abundance”. A form with final /-θ-/ is seen in CA in the pl. ʁunnāθu (perh. sg. \*ʁanθu) lit. “well-refined or cultured person (to be with) in drinking and jovial companionship”.

**3.15.32** Proto-IE-HS [ʼan-] “on the contrary”

IE: Skt. anyas “different, other”, Goth. anþar “other”, Lith. aňtras id.

HS: perh. Egyp. ʼn “on the contrary, again”.

**3.15.33** Proto-IE-HS [-na-] “us, our, we”: see §3.15.36 below.

IE: Ved. nas acc.-gen.-dat. “us”, Hitt. -naš acc.-dat. id., Av. nā “our”, Alb. na “us”, OLat. nōs “we, us”, OCS ny id. IECD, 853; Fortson, 2004: §§7.3-7.7.

HS: CA -nā “us” as in la-nā “for us”, taraka-nā “he left us”, also “our” with nouns, adjectives as in kitābu-nā “our book”, Egyp. -n “we, us, our”, Akk. acc. niāti, nīti, dat. -niāši, nīši. (O’Leary, 1969: §84; Moscati, 1969: §§13.14, 13.16).

**3.15.34** Proto-IE-HS stem [nā-] “we two”

IE: Skt. nāu “we two”, Grk nōi id. OCS na id. IECD, 847.

HS: Egyp. -ny “we two”, Ug. ny id. EG: §34; Moscati, 1969: §13.14. Since the dual ending is suffixed to a pl. form, we can easily tell with certainty that the dual form was pronounced *nā*. See §§2.22.2 above & 3.19.3.2 below.

**3.15.35** Proto-IE-HS stem [nau-] “turn, twist, spin”

IE: ON. snua “to turn”, OCS. snuti “to spin, weave”, Grk nússa “turning-point”. IECD, 1235.

HS: Akk. (š)naʼu “to turn”, etc. see §2.2.53 above, and pay attention to final /-h/ in 2.2.51 above.



**3.15.36** Proto-IE-HS word [naʷ-] “death”

IE: Lat. *nāve* “death”, Latv. *nāve* id., OCz. *nav* id., OCS. *navi* “corpse”, Goth. *naus* “corpse”, ON. *nar* id., OE. *neo-bedd* “death-bed”, Ir. *nuna*, W. *newyn*, Br. *nawn*, Cor. known “hunger”, Toch. A *nwān* “ill”: PIE \**nāu-*. SS: §4.75; IECD: 147; IER, 43.

HS: CA *naʷwu* “death announcement”: *naʷā* “to announce the death of”, Kab. *nʷi* “to afflict”, Som. *naʷ* “to hate”.

### 3.16 *PROTO-IE-HS /w/*

Proto-IE-HS /w/ is a velar glide. It is in PIE /w/ and in PHS /w/.

#### 3.16.1 Proto-IE-HS proot [wa] “and, also”

IE: Ved. u “and”, Skt. u “also”, Grk u (as in pan-u) “altogether”, Goth. -u “and”, Lith. u-gi “and, so”. IECD, 1473.

HS: Akk. u “and”, Assy. u id., Phoen. w, Pun. u, Aram., Heb. wə id., CA wa id., Sab. w “and, but, or” (DRS VI, 473) Har. ā, Amh. a “and” (HED, 17).

#### 3.16.2 Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼaw] “or”

IE: Skt. ā “and, or, but”, Hitt. -a, Grk ē “or”, Alb. o “or”, Lith. o “but”. IECD, 1; WP. I, 99.

HS: Akk. ū “or”, Ug. ʼu, Heb. ʼō, Aram., Jp. ʼō id., Mand. ʼu, Syr., ESE ʼw id., Ge., Har. ʼaw id. (MD, 342; HED, 36; DRS I, 11), OffAram. w “and, or, but, however” (NWSI I, 259), CA ʼaw “or” also “whether; but”, etc. LA.

#### 3.16.3 Proto-IE-HS word [ʼawθ-] “to be; dwell”

IE: Skt. vastu-, vāstu “place”, Av. vāstu- “house, site”, Grk ástu “town”, Toch. A wašt, B ost “house”: Skt. vasati “dwells”, Goth. wisan “to be”, OE., OHG. wesan, ON. vesa id. IECD: 1495, 1523; SS: §14.20; 174; WP. I, 306f; Meillet, Introd. 374.

HS: Egyp. yw “to be”; yw-t “act of being”; ywyw-t “abode, chamber”, CA ba-w-θ “to be”: see §2.21.5.1 above.

#### 3.16.4 Proto-IE-HS [ʼw-n-] “to be; dwell; house”

IE: OE. wunian “to dwell”, OHG. wonēn id., Du., MHg. wonen id.

HS: CA ʼāwā “to lodge, house”; ʼāwaya “to go back home”, ma-ʼwā “shelter, abode”.

With n-ext. as in IE words: Egyp. wen, with loss of initial \*/w/, “to be, exist” also “chamber, room”; wen-t “fortress”, CA ʼanna, fr. \*ʼaw-n “to be”, etc. see §2.1.6.5.25 above; ma-ʼwā “shelter, lodge”, Lih. ʼw “to lodge, seek shelter”, OAram. ʼwyn “seek shelter, seek refuge”, etc. see §2.12.14, n. 5 above.

A surface IE word that expresses “be” is seen in Lith. yra “is”, Latv. ir “be”: [ʼaw-r-] “to dwell, found a dwelling” as in CA ʼuwāra-tu, ʼāra-tu “place-name”, ʼūr (šālīm) “Jerusalem”, i.e. *house or place* (of peace), Heb. yerū-šālayim id., OSA warawa-il “God il has founded”, etc.

#### 3.16.5 Proto-IE-HS stem [ʼaw-] “member of the household”, related to [ʼaw-] “be, exist”

IE: Mlr. ua, ōa “grandson”, W. wyr, Br. d-ouarer id., Lat. avus “grand-father”, Goth. awō “grand-mother”, OCS ujī “uncle”, Pol. wuj, ORuss. awis id. SS: §§2.28 & 2.51.

HS: Egyp. ʼw “children”.

With loss of initial \*/- in both IE and HS: OCS. vûnûkû “grandson”, Russ. vnuk, Ukr. anuk id. = Egyp. wnnw “child, infant”.

### 3.16.6 Proto-IE-HS stem [wal-] “to govern, rule”

IE: OCS. vlasti “to rule”, Ir. falm-, foln- id., Goth. waldan id., OE. wealdan “to govern”, Toch. wāl “king”. SS: §19.31; IECD, 1508; WP. I, 294.

HS: CA waliya “to govern, rule”; wālī “governor”, Tham. wlt “power, strength” also “chief” (Branden, 1950: 513), Sab. wly “protected persons, clients of a clan” (SD, 160), Min. wlw “charge with (a duty)”, Te. wala “guide, lead (camels)” (DRS VII, 549), Phoen. wly “close relationship with a deity” (NWSI I, 297) = CA waliyyu, as in *waliyyu* (‘a)llāhi.

### 3.16.7 Proto-IE-HS stem [wal-] “to desire”

IE: Goth. wiljan “to wish, desire”, OE. willan “to wish”, OLith. velti id. IECD, 1508.

HS: CA waliha “to desire, be fond of”, Şaf. wlh “have a feeling of, nostalgia” (DRS VI, 547), Chad.: Sura wal “to love”, Mpn wāl id. (HSED, n. 2521)

### 3.16.8 Proto-IE-HS stem [law-] “to twist, turn” > PIE \*wal - (by metathesis).

IE: Skt. val- “to turn”, Grk eilēō “to wrap”, Lat. volvere “to roll”, Ir. fillim “to bend, fold”, Arm. geli “to twist”, Latv. velt “to twist, distort”. SS: §§10.12-10.15; IECD, 1506, 1512; WP. I. 298ff.

HS: Akk. lawā “to wrap, encircle”, CA lawā or lawaya “to bend, twist, turn”, Heb. lawa(h) “to fold, twine” (OT, 514), Ge. tālāwyā “be bent”, Tna. lāwāyā “to bend”, Har. lāwa “arc, bow”, Cush.: Ga. lawa id. (HED, 101), SA: Meh. lewō “to turn”, Shh. le id., Chad.: Housa lauya “to bend” (HSED, n. 1658).

### 3.16.9 Proto-IE-HS stem [wan-] “to suffer or have pain due to excessive work”

IE: Goth. winan “to suffer”; winno “pain”, OE. winnan “to work, labor, suffer”, ON. vinna “to work”, OHG. winnan “to fight”.

HS: CA wanna “feebleness, weakness, languidness”, waniya “to languish; fatigue, exhaustion, feebleness, lassitude”, due to *physical exertion*; ’awnā, caus., “to exhaust, wear out”, Egyp. wnwn “to do work in the field” also “to dispute”, Akk. wanā- “to press down, put under pressure”, OAram. yhwnh “to oppress” (DRS VII, 562).

### 3.16.10 Proto-IE-HS [war-] “to cover”

IE: Skt. vṛ- “to cover”, Lat. operīre (fr. \*op-verīre) “to open, shut”, Lith. verti “open or shut”, Latv. vērt “to open”, Goth. warjan, ON. werja, OE. werian “ward off, defend”: PIE \*wer-. SS: §7.22; IECD: 1516; WP. I, 280f.

HS: CA wārā “to cover, bury”; ta-wārā “to hide”, Ge. war’a “to cover, hide” (DRS VII, 615).

For Balt. words above: CA warrā “to hide or cover a thing or object and display (present in public) instead another thing or object” also “make known”; CX ’istawrā “make something hidden open to view”; Heb. hōrē, caus., “to show” (DRS VII, 627).

For Goth. warjan, etc. above: cf. Egyp. wrīt “a protector of the dead” (EHD I, 172). CA proverb: tūrī (fr. tu-wrī) *min sabara*, “it protects, pushes away, prevents”; warraya or warrā “to protect, defend” as in the poetry of Farazdaq

«...la-warrai-tu ’an maulāka wa ’al-lailu muḍlimu» (LA).

Other Related words:

3.16.10a IE: OHG. wirt “host”, OS. wert id., etc.

HS: CA wariy-yu “guest” as in the PIP of A’sha:

«wa tašuddu ‘aḫda wariyya-nā ...» (LA).

Ge. warrə’a “to feed, support” (DRS VII, 614).

3.16.10b IE: Toch. A wär-, B war- “to sense, feel”, etc. IECD, 1516.

HS: CA yūra fr. yu-wrā “he feels” as in the PIP of Labid:

«taslubu ’al-kānisu lam yūra bihā...».

Another poet says:

«da’ānī fa-lam ’ūra’ (fr. ’u-wra’ “I feel”) bihi...» (LA).

To my understanding, Toch. and CA words are, like the two stems below in §§3.16.11 & 3.16.12, from [’ar-] “see”.

There is still one important and common idea expressed by [war-] so closely connected with notion ‘open/close’; this is ‘*something that hinders, protects, or covers*’: CA warā’ “curtain” (in the fixed expression: *min warā’ warā’* “from behind a curtain”, Egyp. wrīt “a kind of garment” (EHD I, 174), Ga. waro “cape, cloak”, warri “door”, Har. wari “frame of a door” (HED, 161) = OCS. and common Sl. vrata “gate”, Lith. vartai id., Osc. veru “door”.

3.16.10c IE: Grk ourános “sky”.

HS: Egyp. wrīt “a name for the sky”, CA’awūru-n “sky”.

**3.16.11** Proto-IE-HS stem [war-] “to speak”, related to [war-] “to see” below.

IE: Grk eirō “to speak, say, tell”, Hitt. weriyami “to call, invite”. IECD, 1516.

HS: Sab. h-wry, caus., “to announce, proclaim” (SD, 57), Ge. waraya “to relate, tell”, Te. wāra “to announce”, CA wariya “to mention metaphorically”, Heb. h-ōrā “to teach”, Har. wār “news”; wār āša “announce, spread the news”, Tna., Amh., Gour. ware, Cush.: Som. war, Bil. ware, etc. see §2.7.31 above.

CA CX ’istaurā “to ask (someone an opinion)” clearly indicates that the word is ultimately from [’ar ~ ra’] “see” (§3.16.10b above).

**3.16.12** Proto-IE-HS stem [war-] “to see, watch, guard”: see §§3.12.7 & 3.12.7 above.

IE: Grk orāō “to see, look”, orig. “to watch”: Hom. oūros “watcher, guard”, OE. waru “guarding”, Lat. verērī “to regard, revere”, Latv. vērtis “to watch, look”: PIE \*wer-. SS: §15.51; WP. I, 284; IECD, 1516.

HS: Egyp. wrh “to guard, protect”, Sab. wr’ “to repulse, intimidate, check” (SA, 161), CA warra’a “to repulse, stop”; ta-wrī’u “prevention”; ta-warra’a “to scruple, feel compunction”, Te. wāra “to battle, threaten” (DRS VII: 616): PHS [war-’-], fr. an ext. of [war-] as in CA warwara “to look at or regard with fixed intention”. With š-ext.: Egyp. werš “to keep a watch; watcher, observer”.

Derivatives of this stem are Grk arēn, Cret. warēn “lamb”, Arm. garn, Pers. bare id., etc. (IECD, 1494) = Egypt. wr “kind of cattle”, Housa wārārī “vicious bull” (HSED, n. 2527), Te. war’e “mountain-goat”.

### 3.1 6.13 Proto-IE-HS stem [war-] “water”: see §3.12.22 above.

IE: Skt. vār “water”, Toch. B war id., Av. vārō “rain”, Av. vairis “lake”, Lith. jurēs id., OE. wær “ocean”: PIE \*wer-. SS: §1.31, IECD, 1494f.

HS: Egypt. wr’t “a mass of water”, wer “lake”, Som. war “pool”, Heb. yārah “to water, sprinkle”; yōreh “the early rain” (OT, 424), Sab. hwr “watercourse, cistern, pool” (SD, 57), Chad.: Housa wuriya “stream”, Miya wər “lake” (HSED, n. 2549).

### 3.16.14 Proto-IE-HS stem [war-] “to throw”

IE: Goth. and common Germ. wairpan “to throw”, Lith. virbėti “to move, twist, tremble”: PIE \*wer-b-, fr. an ext. of a root \*wer-, which is also seen with g-ext. in OCS. vrūga, vrēšti “to throw”, Bulg. vrhati id. SS: §10.25, IECD, 1517.

HS: Ug., Heb. yry “to throw”, CA warra “to throw”, warwara id., Ge. warrawa, warawa “to throw”, Te., Tna. wārwärä “to throw”, Amh., Arg. wārāwwārä id. Cohen (VII, 622f) finds that «the racine est présente á Ebla: /tiwriyum/, /tīriyum/ “jeter”», Chad.: Kabalay weri “to throw”, Dangla ore id. (HSED, 527).

With b-ext. as in Germ. and Baltic: CA waraba “to circumvent, get around”; wirābu “oblique direction”.

### 3.16.15 Proto-IE-HS stem [war-] “power, ability”

IE: Lith. vara “force, violence”, Latv. varēt “be able”, W. gwawr “hero”, Illyr.-Lat. varrō “robber”, ME. warre “war”, etc. IECD, 1493.

HS: Egypt. wr “great, superior”, CA ’a-wrā, comp. adj. in a proverb «*huwā ’a-warā-hum zandan*» “strongest, most powerful (of all)”, Sab. wrw “to attack” (SD, 162), Cush.: Ga. warāna, Som. woran “spear, war”, Aw. woram id. (HED, 161), Te. wārā “to assail, attack from all sides”, Gour. wārār “to attack audaciously”, Har. woran “spear, war”, etc. (DRS VII, 622).

#### Comments

CA warā “suppuration, fester (inside of the body); *often associated with vomiting pus and blood*”, said of a wound, “to suppurate”, may be related to [war-] above. Some of its IE cognates are Skt. vraṇa- “wound, sore”, Alb. warrē “wound”, OCS rona, etc. gen. Sl. “wound”.

### 3.16.16 Proto-IE-HS word [wars-]

IE: OPruss. warsus “lip”, OFris. were, ON. vorr id., OE. wearr “callous skin”. SS: §4.25.

HS: perh. CA warša-nu “upper eyelid”.

### 3.16.17 Proto-IE-HS stem [war-] “a color”

IE: Skt. aruṣa- “reddish”, aruṇa- id., Av. auruša- “white”, OHG. elo “yellow”.

HS: Egyp. wereš “become green”, CA warasa id., with warsu “yellow”, etc. see §3.6.46 above.

**3.16.18** Proto-IE-HS word [warik-] “side; hand, thigh”. In IE initial \*w(a)- has been lost.

IE: OCS. raka “hand”, Russ., Bulg. ruka “hand, arm”, Pol. reka id., with infixal -n-, Lith. ranka, Latv. ruoka “hand, arm”. SS: §§4.31, 4.33.

HS: Sab. wrk “hip, thigh” (SD, 162), CA wariku id., Heb. yārēk “thigh”, Jp. yarakā id., Ug. yrk “side”, Amh. wārc “arm” (DRS VII, 628), Ga. arka “hand”.

For Ug. yrk: cf. CA wirku “side of a bow”.

A form without /w-/ is perh. CA rakka “to touch s.t. with the hand in order to know its size, to weigh with the hand”.

**3.16.19** Proto-IE-HS stem [was- or ’as-] “good”.

IE: Hitt. wasu-, wasa- “good”, Grk eús “valiant, virtuous”, Skt. vasuh “good”. IECD: 1530.

HS: Ug. ysm “beautiful, pleasant” (UG, 530), CA wasimu “handsome”; mi-ysamu “beauty”; wasmu “piety, godliness”.

All are related to CA waisu, an *arch.* word used to express “prettiness and affection”. The word also expresses “woe to”, though not as strong as *waiḥu*, *wailu*, etc., which are from [way or wai] “woe”. In addition, the word expresses “wish, desire”: *waisan* as in He got *waisan*, i.e. He got *what he wishes for*. The expected problem here is that the same *waisan* can express a contradictory meaning ‘what he does not wish for’.

For notion of ‘wish’, perh. Egyp. w’š id. A natural question arises here: *Isn’t CA /w-/ here a very ancient neg.?*

**3.16.20** Proto-IE-HS word [was’- ~ waš’] “be vast, wide”

IE: Lat. vastus “vast, immense”, OIr. fota “length”. SS: §12.57, WP. I, 220.

HS: CA wasī’u, wāsi’u, adjs., “vast, spacious, wide”: wasi’a “be vast, wide, spacious, broad, far-stretched”; si’atu “wideness, roominess, etc.”; CVIII ’ittasa’a (i.e. ’iwtasa’a) “be expanded, lengthened”, Egyp. wes “be broad, wide”, weseh “be wide, spacious”, Qat. yts’ “be large, extensive”, Sab. ws’ “to augment”; š’ “quantity (of water)”, Chad.: Migama waase “swell, become bigger”: see §2.12.6 above.

For OIr. fota: cf. ’ittasa’a above, said of the daylight or anything, “lengthen in space or in time”.

**3.16.21** Proto-IE-HS word for “be equal”

IE: Grk ísos “equal”, prob. Skt. viṣu- “on both sides”.

HS: Egyp. ’wsw “balance”, Ug. m-wznm, pl., “balance” (UG, 530), Ge. mizān id., Te., Tna., Amh. mizan id., CA mi-zānu id.; wazana, dial. zāna “to weigh”, Heb. ’izzēn id. (DRS VIII, 754): HS \*waz-n- from an ext. of [waz-] as in CA wāza “to equal, be equal to”; mu-wāzi “equal or equivalent to, parallel to or with”.

**3.16.22** Proto-IE-HS stem [waš-] “be empty; empty”

IE: OIr. fass “empty”, Lat. vāstus “waste, desert”, OE. wēste, OHG. wuosti “waste; empty”: PIE \*wast-, fr. an ext. of PIE \*was-, seen in words for “empty” as in Lat. vascuus id., Skt. vasikah id., W. gwag, etc. id. SS: §13.22; IECd, 1498, 1495; WP. I, 108f, 209.

HS: Egyp. wes “be empty” ~ weš “be empty; emptiness”, with r-ext.: wešer id.

### 3.16.23 Proto-IE-HS stem [wāh-] “be exhausted, weak”

IE: Skt. vāyati “becomes exhausted”, Lith. vījes “suffering”, Latv. vājš “weak”.

HS: CA wahiya “become weak, exhausted”; adj. wāh-in, Egyp. why “to fail”; whys “to exhaust”.

Hitt. weh-zi “falls, turns” = CA wahā “to fall” (LA).

### 3.16.24 Proto-IE-HS word [wahy-] “to seek, inquire for”

IE: Skt. veti “seeks, approaches eagerly”, Av. vayeiti “pursues”, Lith. vyti “to pursue”, Latv. vajāt id., Grk íemai “be eager”. SS: §10.53.

HS: Egyp. why “to seek, inquire for”, CA wahā “to seek eagerly or deliberately, to inquire for, aim at”; ta-wahhā “intend upon, fix the mind upon”, Ge. waḥaya “to visit, inspect, oversee” (DRS, VI, 525), Chad.: Mandara waya “to want, look for”, Zime wa id., Mokilko wi’e “to look for” (HSED, n. 2515).

### 3.16.25 Proto-IE-HS stem [wa’-] “to slaughter, wound”

IE: Grk oteilē “wound”, Lith. votic “ulcer, boil”, Latv. vāts id.: PIE \*wā-. SS: §4.85.

HS: Egyp. w’w’ “to slaughter, slay”, CA wa’ā “to generate pus (only a wound), fester (a wound or from inside the body)”; wa’yu “fester, pus, suppuration”, Ge. wə’əya “be hot”, Amh. wa’əy “heat”, etc. (HED, 162).

#### Comments

The IE words above are equivalent to HS CVIII as in CA ’i-tta’a, i.e. ’iwta’a “be festered (a wound)”: see §§2.1.7.3 & 2.8 above.

### 3.16.26 Proto-IE-HS word [waθ- or was-] “dress, garment”

IE: Lat. vestis “garment”, Toch. B wastsī “garment”, Grk: Ion. éinumi “dress”, Hitt. wess-, wass “to clothe”, Luw. waššanti “they clothed”, Skt. vasana- “clothing”: vas- “clothe”, Lith. aveti “wear shoes”. IHL: §60b; SS: §6.12.

HS: Ug. and gen. Sem. kst, mks “clothing”, fr. [was]: see §2.17.83.13 above.

### 3.16.27 Proto-IE-HS stem [wais-] “be in ruined state”

IE: Av. vaešo- “suffering”, Goth. waisiza “worse”, Arm. giši, gišaw “bad”.

HS: Egyp. wys “be in a ruined state, feeble, weak”, CA waisu “poverty”.

### 3.16.28 Proto-IE-HS word [wain-] “fault, error, sin”

IE: OCS. vina “fault, guilt”, Russ. vina, Pol. wina id., Latv. waina id. SS: §16.76.

HS: Egyp. wn (fr. \*wyn) “fault, error, sin”, CA wain “fault, defect, blemish”.

### 3.16.29 Proto-IE-HS stem [way-] “branch, tree”

IE: Skt. *vaya-* “branch”, OCS. *větvī* id., Lith. *vytis* “osier”, OPruss. *witwan*, OHG. *wīdo* “willow”, ON. *viðir* id.: PIE \**wei-*. SS: §8.55.

HS: CA *’uway’a-tu*, dim., “tree”, Egyp. *yw* “a plant”.

With *ḏ*-ext.: perh. Egyp. *wyḏ* “twig”. The only possible CA cognate is *wayḡu* “wooden yoke by which pair of oxen is harnessed”. This is one of very rare examples where Egyp. /*ḏ*/ corresponds to CA palatal stop /*ḡ*/. It is possible, however, that Egyp. /-*ḏ*/ and CA /-*ḡ*/ are two different proots.

### 3.16.30 Proto-IE-HS word [’awn-] “wood, tree”

IE: Skt. *vana-* “wood(s), tree”, Av. *vanā-* “tree”.

HS: Egyp. *wn-t* “cypress”, *’wn-t* “a kind of wood, cypress” also “pole of a chariot”, CA *’iwānu* “pole or pillar of a tent”. For Egyp. initial /’/, see §2.14 above.

3.16.31 Proto-IE-HS word [’əwr-] “man”, related to [’aw-] “to be, exist”, as in Egyp. *’wr* “human being”, with loss of inial [’-]: CA *warā*, coll., “human being”; *warā’u* “grandson” = Lat. *vir* “man”, OE. *wer* id., Skt. *vīra-* id., etc. Otherwise, the IE words = Ug. *’ry* “kinsman”, Egyp. *’rī* “friend, companion”, etc. Cush. words for “man”, as in Kaf. *ūrō* “man”, Sid. *arō* “husband”, etc., may be fr. either root.

3.16.32 Proto-IE-HS stem [’uwis-, ’aus-, or ’ūs-] “small cattle: sheep & goats”. Final /-s/ is from an earlier /-θ/, and this marks the stem is as fem.

IE: Hitt. *awas* “sheep”, Skt. *avis*, Grk. *oīs*, Lat. *ovis*, Lith. *avis*, OIr. *oi*, OCS. *ovīca* “sheep”, OE. *eowu*, OHG. *ewi* “ewe”: PIE \**owis-*. Meillet, *Introd.* 353; *IECD*, 897; *WP*. I, 167.

HS: CA *’ūsu* coll. “a kind of sheep”, Egyp. *’wt* “sheep & goats”, Housa *awa-ki*, pl., “goat”, etc. see §2.23.10, esp. n. 5f above.

3.16.33 Proto-IE-HS stem [haw’-] “wind”, deriv. of \**haw-* as in CA *hauwā* “to stir or move air, ventilate”: *hawā* “to blow (wind)”, Skt. *vā-* “to blow”, OHG. *wajan* id.

IE: Skt. *vātas* “wind”, Av. *vāta-*, Hitt. *hwandas* id., Arm. *hov* id., Lith. *vėjas*, OCS. *větrū* id., Cor. *awel* “wind, storm”: with infixed -n-: Lat. *ventus* “wind”, Goth. and common Germ. *winds* id., Toch. A *want*, B *yante* id, Cor. *awel* “wind, storm”. IHL: §37j; SS: §1.72.

HS: Egyp. *hwhw* “puff of wind”, CA *hawā’-un* “air, wind”, Kab. *haua* “air”; Amh. *hawāhəw* “atmosphere”, Mand. *tiha* “breath, steam, vapor”, Chad.: Bachama *hawey* “wind”, Bata *haue* id. (DRS V, 385; HSED, n. 1165; MD, 485).

### 3.16.34 Proto-IE-HS proot [haw-] “love, desire”

IE: Lat. *aveō* “to desire”, W. *awydd* “earnest desire”, Grk. Hom. *en-ēēs* “benign”, Skt. *avis* “favorable”.

HS: CA *hawiya* “to love, desire”, Ga. *hawa* “to covet”, Som. *hawo* “to wish, desire”, Oromo *haw-* “to desire”, Ometo *ea* “to love” (DRS V, 386). Albright, *JAOS*, 47, 224 connects Egyp. *hy* “husband”, as originally “lover”, with CA *hawā* “love”.



There is still a root [ʾwy] expressing “to desire” as in DA ʾwy “to desire” (NWSI I, 22), Heb. ʾwy “to desire, long for” (OT, 20-21), CA ʾawā or ʾawiya “to pity for, have tender feeling for”. The two words are of two different origins.

With m-ext. in CA hāma “be infatuated with”, Tham. hm “to love” (Branden, 1950: 513).

### 3.16.35 Proto-IE-HS word [ḥawar-] “to curse”

IE: Hitt. huwartaš “to curse”, Pal. u-e-er-ti “says, call”, Grk eíroō “I say”, Skt. vrata- “to command”, Lat. verbum “word”, Goth. waurd “word”, etc. SS: §18.21. Sturtevant (IHL: §47g) connects the Hitt. word above with Hitt. weriya- “to name, call”, and so does Lehmann (PIEP: §§25, 3.4). Let us suppose that they are related, *what is the signification or function of /hu-/*?

HS: Egyp. s-ḥwr, caus., “to curse”, CA CIII ḥāwara, *involving two or more persons*, “to argue, dialogue; conversation”. It is somewhat surprising that the CA root does not have stems I, II, and IV among some others.

For Hitt. weriya, see §3.16.11 above.

### 3.16.36 Proto-IE-HS stem [ḥaw-] “ear”

IE: Lat. auris “ear”, OE. and common Grem. ēare id., OIr. ō, au id., Lith. ausis id., Av., OPers. ušī “two ears”, OCS uši id., Hitt. ehuratiš “ear stopper”; ehurada “to stop (one’s) ear”, etc. PIE \*aus-, a deriv. of \*au- “to perceive, observe, see” as in Skt. avis “evidently”, Grk aīō “to perceive, see, observe, hear”, Hitt. uhhi “I see”. SS: §4.22; SOE: §221; Meillet, Introd. 365; IECD, 43; WP. I, 18.

Before citing the HS cognates, it may be well to point out clearly the origin of the Hitt. *ehurada* above. The word is a compound of \*ehur- (fr. \*XeXu-r-) “ear” and \*-ad- “deaf”. The second part of the compound is identical with the HS root in Egyp. yd “be deaf”; yedd-ti “deaf ears”. For a different analysis of the Hitt. compound, see IHL: §46a.

HS: Egyp. ḥḥw’ “two ears”. The CA cognate is seen with r-ext.: ma-ḥāra-tu [ḥwr] “inner ear”, ḥurra- “ear (prob. orig. for domestic animals)” (fr. \*ḥuwra-) occurred in dual form ḥurra-tāni as in Poet. of Ka’bu bin Zuhair

«ḵanwā’u fī ḥurratayha...etc.» LA.

Apart from Hitt., IE words above are direct cognates with the HS word in CA ḥawāsu “the five senses”, sg. ḥāsa-tu fem., as a vb ʾaḥassa “to perceive, feel, sense”, Syr. ḥwš “to feel, perceive”, EHeb., Jaram. ḥšš “to consider, take into consideration” (NWSI I, 412).

### 3.16.37 Proto-IE-HS word [ḥau-] “to weave”

IE: Skt. vona “weaving”, otum, inf., “to weave”; ūta “woven”, Lith. austi, Latv. aust id.: OE. wīr “wire”, wīl “trick”, ON. vāð “cloth”. Lehmann (PIEP: §68) reconstructs PIE \*Hew-.

HS: Egyp. h’ly “to weave; stuff, garment”, h’l’ “strap, thong”: CA ḥiyālu, r. ḥwl, “a thread, strap”; ḥīla-tu “trick”,

With š-ext.: CA ḥāša “to saw”,

With k-ext.: CA ḥāka “to weave”; ḥawku, ḥūwūka-tu “woven garment”.

With /-t-/ as in Skt. otum, ūta above: CA ḥautak-iyya-tu fem. (a noun derived from CVIII ḥtāka “be woven”) “head-dress”. Note that /-iyya-/ = *belonging to* (-ḥtāka “be woven”).

It is most likely that CA CVIII -ḥtāka and its derivative ḥautak- = Av. aḥka-, Skt. atkas “cloak, mantle”. Here also belong Hitt. ha-at-k- “to close” and Egyp. ḥwkn “door bolt”.

**3.16.38** Proto-IE-HS stem [hɛw-] “grow, increase”

IE: Hitt. huwai “to grow”.

HS: Egyp. hyw “to increase”.

**3.16.39** Proto-IE-HS word [ḥar-] “and, because, therefore”

IE: OCS jere “because, for”, Lith. ir “and, and then, and so”, Latv ir “and”, Mir. ar “for, indeed”, Grk. ár “indeed”. IECD, 31.

HS: Egyp. ḥr “and, because, therefore, with”.

**3.16.40** Proto-IE-HS proot [wiy-] “way, road”

IE: Lat. via “road, street”, Umb. via, vea id., Lith. vyti “to pursue”, Av. vayeiti “pursues”. SS: §10.71.

HS: Egyp. wy “way, road”, wyt “to depart”, perh. CA na-wiy “travel-friend”, i.e. *road-friend*.

**3.16.41** Proto-IE-HS proot [wā-] “woe, alas”

IE: Grk. ai “alas”, Lat. vae “woe, alas”, Goth. wai “woe”, OE. wā, ON. vei id., Arm. way “woe”, Hitt. uwai “pity”, OCS uvy “alas”, Lith., Latv. vā id. With l-ext.: ON. weila, væla “wail”.

HS: Akk. ai, CA wā(h) “woe, alas”, Heb. wāy “woe, misery”, Hatra. wy “woe, alas”; With l-ext.: CA wailu “woe to, wail”, walwala “to wail, lament”, OAram. yll “lamentation”. IECD, 1485.

*Comments*

Hitt. and OCS words above find their exact cognate in CA ḥuwwāh “expressing sorrow, grief” also “alas”.

A complex word made by compounding [ʾa-] with the compound [wal-] is seen in Lat. ēiulare “to wail, lament”, Br. wylo “to weep, cry”, CA ḥawīlu “wailing, lamenting (aloud)”, etc. For [ʾa-], see §2.14 above.

**3.16.42** Proto-IE-HS stem for *1<sup>st</sup> pers. pron.*

IE: Hitt. wei(s) “we”, Toch. B. wes, Ved. vayam id., Av. vaēm, OE. and common Grm. wē id.

HS: Egyp. wí “I”.

### 3.17 PROTO-IE-HS /y/

Proto-IE-HS /y/ is a palatal glide. It is in PIE /y/ and in PHS /y/.

#### 3.17.1 Proto-IE-HS stem [h̥ai-] “lifetime, life”

IE: Skt. āyu- “lifetime, age”, Lat. aevum “lifetime”, Goth. aiws id., OHG ēwo id., Grk. aiōn “eternity, age”. IECD, 7; WP. I, 6.

HS: CA ḥayā-tu “lifetime, life”; ḥayawā-nu (Koranic) “eternity”, Ug. ḥy-t “life”, ḥym id., OAram. ḥyn id., Sab. ḥywt id.

#### 3.17.2 Proto-IE-HS word [h̥air-] “year, time”, related to [h̥ai-] above

IE: OPers. -yāra “season, year”, Av. yārə “year”, Grk. hōros id. Alb. herē “time”, Goth. and common Grm. jēr “year”. IECD, 451.

HS: CA: Koranic ḥīn (14: 35): «*tu’ tī ’ukulahā kulla ḥīnin*» has been understood by some scholars as “year”, by some others as “six months”, and still others “any period of time”. As a matter of fact, the signification of the word in the verse *can only be* “a year” and nothing else (see verses 34 and 35 of the same *Chapter*, also LA). *A tree yields fruit every year* (not every six months or on every moment”, etc., *and such fruit are eaten every year*, i.e. *in its season* (and not on every moment all the year round), unless they had at that time (in the 7<sup>th</sup> century) the means of freezing and preserving fruit for everyday consumption. Sab. ḥyn “time”

With r-ext.: CA ḥārī “forever, ever”; ḥairiyu “always, forever”.

#### 3.17.3 Proto-IE-HS proot [h̥ai-] “to live”, related to [h̥ai-] above

IE: Grk. zōō “live”, Alb. ndër-zej “breed”. IECD, 450.

HS: CA and gen. Sem. ’a-ḥyā “I live”.

#### 3.17.4 Proto-IE-HS stem [’ay-] “which, who”

IE: Ved. ya-, Av. yā-, Skt. yas- “which, who”, OCS i-že id., Grk. hos id.; ios “one”, Hier Hitt. yas “which, this”, Phryg. ios “which, this”, Gaulish -io as in *dugiionti-io* “who serve”. PIE \*’eya- as reconstructed by Sapir and adopted by Lehmann (PIEP: §10.3b); IECD, 452; WP I, 98; IHL: §74c.

HS: Akk. ayyu “which, who”, CA ’ayyu id., etc.

Sapir (see PIEP above) finds that the PIE form above is the original form which the various pronouns developed. This statement holds true for HS, hence CA ’aina “where”, ’aiyāna “when”, ’aiyun “whoever”, etc., Akk. ēka (fr. ’aika) “where”, etc. see §2.20.2-7 above. Among IE words derived from \*’eya- are Skt. yatha- “where”, yadā “when”, yati “how many”.

#### 3.17.5 Proto-IE-HS stem [h̥en-] “young”

IE: Skt. yūn- “young”, Av. yava, gen. yūnō “young man”, Lith. jaunas, Latv. jauns id., Lat. iuvenis id. IECD, 447; SS: §14.14; WP. I, 200.

HS: Egyp. ḥwn “be/become young”; ḥwnw “young man, boy”; ḥwn-t “girl”.

**3.17.6** Proto-IE-HS stem [ḥai-S-] “to mix” (S = *undetermined*)

IE: Skt. yūṣa-, yus “soup”, Lat. iūs, Lith. jušė id., OCS juxa id.: Skt. yuvati “mixes”.  
PIEP: §10.4e, IECD, 456; WP. I, 199.

HS: CA ḥaisu “mixing of food, mixture of dates and butter kneaded vehemently, mixture”: ḥāsa “to mix”, ḥisā’u (fr. ḥiyāsu) “soup”.

**3.17.7** Proto-IE-HS stem [hai-] “grain”

IE: Grk. zeíá “spelt”, Lith. javaĩ “grain”, Ir. eorna “barley”, Ved., Av. yava- “grain”.  
PIEP: §10.4c; IECD, 448; WP. I, 202.

HS: Egyp. ḥy’ “grain”.

With rn-ext. as in OIr.: Egyp. ḥym “grain”.

With m-ext.: Egyp. ḥyms, CA ḥāma-tu fem. “ear of corn”.

With š-ext.: Akk. ḥūwašte “a kind of grain” (AG, 78).

**3.17.8** Proto-IE-HS word [ḥeṣ-] “rope, girt”

IE: Grk. zostós “girt”, Av. yāsta-, Lith. juostas id.: Grk. zōnnūmi “gird”, Lith. juosti id., OCS po-jasati id., Skt. yasu n. “embrace”. PIEP: §10.4a; IECD, 452, 456; WP. I, 209

HS: CA ḥaiyaša “to gird”; ḥiyāša-tu “girdle, thong”, Egyp. ḥsy (fr. \*ḥys) “rope, cord”.

*Comments*

Lehmann (PIEP: §10.1ff) and Sturtevant (IHL: §74ff), following Edward Sapir, hold that Grk ζ, i.e. /z/, has developed from an initial cluster \*Xy, i.e. *of a laryngeal* + -y, and that the laryngeal was voiced. However, the earlier phonetic nature of the laryngeal- *whether it is voiced or not*- is an unnecessary condition unless it is meant that *it is natural to have a voiced laryngeal before /-y/ in a cluster like Xy-* (with no intervening vowel), *since assimilation of voice will take place*.

**3.17.9** Proto-IE-HS stem [hair-] “hard red stone”

IE: OCS jarǫ “harsh”, Russ. yaryj “burning, flashing”.

HS: Egyp. hyr “be hard” also “to oppress”, CA ya-hyaru “hard red stone”, which identifies *‘the thing’* described by Sl. words as being “harsh, burning, and flashing”.

**3.17.10** Proto-IE-HS proot [ʔay-] “to come” and “to go”

IE words for “to come” and “to go” are from from one single root and may be classified as follows:

IE: Av. yā- “to go”, Tock. yā- id., Hitt. ehu “to come, to go”, i-ya-at-ta “go, march”, i-it “go!”, Skt. yāti “goes”, ihi, ita “go!”, Lith. eiti, Latv. iet “to go”, OCS iti: Lat. iānua “door, entrance”: PIE \*ei-. HCG: §§61a, 61d; IHL: §52c; SS: §10.47; WP. I, 102ff DRLE, 46.

IE: Hitt. imper. it “come”, Pal. imper. i-u id., Luw. i-i-ta “went”, OPers. aitiy “goes”, Av., Skt. i-, Lat. īre “to go”, Lith. ateiti “to come”. HCG: §61b; SS: §10.48.

HS: an imper. form *Ci* (C = consonant) is common with roots having two weak radicals like CA *ḵi* “protect, guard!” as in *ḵi-nā* “protect us (-nā = us). On the other hand, a term identical with those of IE is Assy. *i* “come”.

HS words expressing “to come” and “to go” are:

a) Egyp. *yw* “to come”, Berb.: Izayan *iya*, Kab. *əyya* “come”, Chad.: Ngizim *ya* “come”, Logone *awa* “to come”, Boghom *yuway* “run”, Tum. *ye* “go”, Diri *’a* “come”, Tumak *a-*, Mokilko *’aa’-* “go” Cush.: Bed. *yi’*, *i’* “to come”, Som. *yaa’* “run away” (Muller, 1975: 69, n. 73; HSED, n. 1, 2566).

The Semitic cognate is *’atawa/’ataya*, with infixed /-t-/, “to come, to go” as in CA *’ataya* “to come, to go”, Ug. *’tw* “to come”, OAram., OffAram., *’th* “to come, to go”, etc. §2.8.41 above, also §3.5.33 above.

For Lat *iānua* “door, entrance” above, it corresponds to Egyp. *’w* “door”, *’w* “doorkeeper”; *’i-t* “house, abode” = CA *ma-’ānu id.*

If the Lat. word is truly from “to come or to go”, then Proto-IE-HS had a proot [*’a*], which may lie beneath a large number of roots expressing ‘*motion*’ such as Egyp. *’w* “travel”, *’w* “bring”, *’n* “to turn, return”, *’ḵ* “go in, enter”, *’p* “go, travel, go in, march, escape”, *’p* “fly”. What may confirm this view is that Egyp. evidence itself tends to support it: comp. Egyp. *’p* with *yp’* “make to fly”, fr. caus. /y-/ (< ’-: see §2.3 above) plus [*p’* or *’p*]. The Sem. cognate is in CA *’āfa* [*’yf*], Ug., Heb. *’wp*, etc. “to fly”. Semitic evidence also supports it: comp. Egyp. *’n* above with Sem. *š-n-* (see §2.2.53 above), etc.

Conclusive evidence confirming that PHS had a proot [*’a-*] also comes from CA *’ai-*: see §2.17.40 above.

#### *Comments I*

The earlier presence of a stem [*ya’-*] “to go, move, come” cannot be ignored. This stem is bound in Sem. as in Sab. *hy’* “to run, flow”, CA *hā’a id*, CA *mā’a* “to flow”, *sā’a* “to get lost, perish”, fr. *’to go’*, *rā’a* [*ry’*] “to come back”: comp. *’āra* [*’yr*] “go and come back to excess”, etc. See IE-HS words in §3.14.29 above.

#### *Comments II*

Hitt. *ehu* above shows a laryngeal = Egyp. *yhi* “to go, to march”.

#### **3.17.11** Proto-IE-HS stem [*haig-*] “to stir, rouse”

IE: Skt. *abhi-yujāmi* “to attack”, Av. *yaoz-* “to stir, be roused”, Arm. *huzem* “stir”, Toch. *yuk* “defeat”, Goth. *jiuka* “passion, temper”, ON. *eikr* “draught-animal”. IECD, 446.

HS: CA *hāgā*, CII *haiyağa* “to stir up, excite, rouse”; *ta-hāyağa* “to fight, attack one another”; *haiġu*, *haiġā(’)* “war, battle”; *haiġu* “longing to; sexual intercourse”; *haiġu* “draught”; *hāğa-tu fem.* “sheep longing for sexual intercourse”. Sab. *hyg* “battle” (SD, 58).

#### **3.17.12** Proto-IE-HS word [*γaid-*] “boil”.

IE: Grk. zēō “to seethe, boil”, Skt. yas-, Av. yah- “to boil”, OE. giest “yeast”, OHG. jesan “ferment”, Alb. ziej “to boil”. IECD, 444, WP. I, 208.

HS: perh. CA ta-γaiyuḏu “boiling” (Koran, 25: 12, also see LA); γaiḏu “very hot”: comp. with words in §3.7.54 above.

**3.17.13** Proto-IE-HS word ‘*ḥayawān*’ “animal” (see §§3.17.1, 3.17.3 above)

IE: Grk ζῷον “animal”.

HS: CA ḥayawān “animal”, Phoen. ḥy-t id.

### 3.18 Additional IE-HS word correspondences

1. Lat. *urceus* “pitcher, jar”, Grk *úrke* “a kind of jar”, Goth. *aurkjus* = Egyp. *ʿrḳ* “vase”, CA *ʾaraḳu* “a kind of vessel”.

2. Lat. *aequus* “equal” = Egyp. *ʿḳw*-t “equilibrium”.

3. Skt. *ácva-* “horse, stallion”, Toch. *yuk* “horse”, Grk *hippos* “mare” also “horse”, Lith. *ešva* “mare”, OIr. *ech* “horse”, OE. *eoh* “war-horse”, Goth. *aihwa-tundi* lit. “horse tooth” = perh. CA *ʾaḳūḳu* expresses, according to Abu Hatim (see LA), both “pregnant mare” and its contradictory meaning, i.e. *sterile mare*; *ʾa-ʾaḳḳa*, refers only to ‘mare’ and ‘she-ass’, “be pregnant”, Ug. *ʿḳḳ* “ravenous beast”.

CA still has a word *ʾawhaḳu* “a stallion”, existed in ancient times and it is believed to be the ancestor of all well-bred horses. Its initial [ʾa-] = “lofty” (see §2.14 above), and the word is ult. the same as *hiḳ-* “ostrich”.

4. Lat. *cabullus* “gelding”, OCS. *kobyła* “mare” = CA (*ḏū ʾal*) *kablaini*, dual., lit. “with two fetters” = a term for ‘gelding’ in pre-Islamic times (LA), assumed to be derived from *kablu* “fetter”.

Buck (SS: §3.41) considers Lat. *cabullus* as a loan word from an *unknown source*, but later (SS: §3.44) he apparently changes his mind and connects it with Lith. *kumelē* “mare”, OCS. and common Sl. *konjī* “horse” and derive them fr. a root *\*kobnjo*.

Buck’s hypothetical root actually exists nowhere but in CA *\*kubnu*, preserved in the adj. *ma-kbunu*, said of a horse, “having short legs and wide chest”, fr. an ext. of a stem [kab-] in CA *kubba-tu*, *kabkaba-tu*, coll., “horse”. A basic question arises here: *Can we trace* Egyp. *ḳnw* “stallion, fine strong horse” *to this* [kub-]? It is possible that the Egyp. word = CA *ʾaḳna* adj., n. *ḳunwu* “having a bent nose (horse)”. This marked characteristic is seen in *hybrid horses*; *ḳanā-tu* “wild cow”.

Lith. *kumelē* (*\*kubelē*) and OCS. *kobyła* are both from Latin *cabullus*. It seems that Lat. *capulum* (LLat.) “lasso” (Fr. *cable*, NE. *cable*”, etc.) = CA *kābūlun* id.

Some words for “horse, mare, calf, foal” are:

4a. OIr. *gerrān* “gelding” = CA *ḡāruru* (Poet.) “slow horse”, orig. “foal, colt”: cf. *ḡarra* “to exceed eleven months of pregnancy (mare)”.

4b. Alb. *mez* “foal”, Arm. *mozi* “calf”, regarded as of Illyrian origin: Egyp. *ms* “bull calf” also “baby”.

4c. NGrk. *āti* “horse”, Serbo-Croatian *at* id. < Turkish *at* id. = Egyp. *ḥty* “horse”.

4d. Polish *ogier*, Serbo-Croatian *ajgir* “stallion” < Turkish *aygir* id. < CA *ḥiḡru* “mare”.

4e. Lith. *eržilas* “stallion”, Latv. *ērslis* id.: CA *ʾargala-tu*, coll., “horse”.

5. Skt. *ábda-* (fr. *\*cab-da*: cf. SS: §15.44) “sound” ~ *áp-* “curse” = Akk. *ḳabū* “to say” (AG, 95), Phoen. *ḳbb* “to curse”; *ḳbh* “curse” (NWSI II, 977-978), CA *ḳābba-tu*, in a fixed expression, “voice, sound” ~ *ḳabību* id. (MA, 321).

6. LLat. cattus, catta “cat” (> Germ. catt, Lith. katė, OCS. kotŭka): CA ʕittu “cat”.  
Some other words for animals are:
- 6a. OIr. menn “kid”, W. myn, Br. men id. = Egyp. mn “sheep, goats, cattle”.  
6b. Grk kamēlos, Lat. camēlus “camel” < Egyp. k’m’l, CA ʕamalu id.  
6c. Skt. kapi- “monkey” = Egyp. kf, kwfi “ape” ~ gf “ape, monkey”  
6d. A very rare example of ‘*accidental similarity*’ is the following:  
Grk. skŭlion “dogfish”, skŭlax “whelp, dog”, ON. skolli “fox”.  
CA salūḫ-ī “hunting dog”, lit. *from, belonging to, or of* (= -ī) *Salūḫ*, an ancient Arabian city was famous in breeding dogs.
7. Lat. glōria “glory” = CA ʕalālu “glory”; ʕalāla-tu “majesty, sublimity”, Syr. glal “glory”, Ga. galata “glorious”, etc. (see §3.4.13 above).
8. Skt. ruja- “destroying, breaking” = Egyp. rg “to destroy”, CA raḡḡa “to shake violently, quake”.
9. Lat. regiō “boundary lines, region” = CA ’a-rḡā’u, pl., “side, place, region”.
10. Skt. nagara “city” = CA naḡr-ān, name of a city in Saudi Arabia.
11. OE. wāc “weak”, ON. weikr, OHG. weich id. = Egyp. wg’ “be weak”, CA waḡiya, ’awḡā “to fail, be hopeless”.
12. Grk agorázo “to buy”: agorá “market-place” < Akk. agaru “to hire”, Ug. ’gr id.
13. OCS. potu “sweat”, Russ., Bulg., Pol. pot id. = Egyp. ft “sweat”: \*puq-tu (§3.8.5 above).
14. OHG. baccho “jaw”, OE. bæc “back” (OIr. fiacail “tooth”, NIr. fiacal id., from a from *fec* “tooth” (cf. SS: §4.27) = CA fakku “jaw”.
15. Lith. pa- “under, after”, Latv. pa- id., OCS. po- id. = *perh.* Egyp. ph “beyond”.
16. Skt. spr̥ “to win” = Egyp. spy “to benefit, prosper, thrive”.
17. Grk spáthē “flat blade” (?) < Egyp. sft, sfd, sf’t “sword”, CA saifu id., etc.
18. Skt. pums- “man”, without any clear outside connections = CA fi’āmu or fiyām, fayāmu “a group of people”.
19. Lat. pirum “pear” = Eth. fre “fruit”, Ga. firi id., etc.
20. W. afu “liver”, Br. avu id. *perh.* = Egyp. wf’ “lung”.



21. Hitt. huhupal “a musical instrument” = Egyp. ḥpp “to play a musical instrument”, CA CVIII ḥṯafala “to celebrate”, ḥafla-tu “party, celebration”.

22. Goth. falpan, etc. gen. Grm. “to fold”, Ug. plṯ “to roll” (UG, 535), Heb. plš “to roll, make to revolve” (OT, 849), SL *laff* “to fold”, while *fall* “unfold”.

23. Goth. fauho “fox”, OHG. fuhs, ON. foa “fox” perh. CA ṽfuḫu pl. “wolf”.

24. Lith. puikus “proud” also “magnificent” = CA fāṽiḫu “magnificent, outstanding”.

25. Lat. aeris “copper”, Goth. aiz, OE. ār, OHG. ēr : Sem.: cf. Akk. erū “copper”.

26. Lat. aurum “gold” < Sem.: cf. Akk. hr̥ṣ “gold”.

27. Lat. ferrum “iron” < Sem.: cf. Cush. fer “iron”.

28. OHG. ram “ram”, OE. ramm id., Du. ram id. = Ug. rum, Heb. remu “buffalo”.

29. Skt. ṛṇa- “debt” (?) < Aram. rhn, CA rahnu “mortgage”, Sab. rhn “pledge, hostage”, CA rahnu “mortgage”; rahīna-tu “hostage”; rāhana “to bet”.

30. Lat. rārus “thin”, Lith. retas id., OCS. rêdûkû id.: PIE \*rē- “loose, thin” (SS: §12.66) = CA raḥwu “loose, thin”, rataḥa, with infix /-t-/ “make loose”.

31. Ir. rōi “field”, OCS. ravînû “even, level” = Akk. rītu “pasture”, CA ma-r’ā id.

32. Skt. ravi- “sun”, Arm. arev id., Ir. re “moon” = perh. Egyp. r’ “sun”, Chad. mokilko ra “sun, god”, Sha are “sun”, Geji ri id. (HSED, n. 2088).

33. Lat. abies “fir, spruce” = Egyp. ḥbw “a sacred tree”, Ga. abayi “a kind of tree”, CA either ḥabā’a-tu “thicket” or ḡāba-tu “forest”.

34. Lat. branca “paw of an animal” is perh. = CA burṯunu id. A special attention should be given to an unexpected relation between θ/p and a velar: comp. Egyp. ḥmn “eight” & Sem. ṯmn id.

35. Grk lébōs (> Lat. lebēs) “kettle” (?): Egyp. reb (leb) “pot, bowl, vessel”.

36. Lith. burē, Lett. bur’a “sail” = Egyp. br’ “ship, boat”, Ug. br id.

37. Skt. rabh- “to seize, grasp, take” = CA rb’ “to carry, lift; be strong”, Ug. rb’ “to bring”.

38. OE. *rib* “rib”, OHG. *rippa*, ON. *rif* id., OCS. and common Sl. *rebro* id. = CA *rabwu* “a disease of the lungs, asthma”.

39. OCS. *doba* “time”, Bulg., Cz., Pol. *doba* id. = Egyp. *dbw* “a period of time” (SL *daub*+ any suffix-pronoun “at this time, right now” also *just* in the sentence: He has *just* arrived).

40. OE. *penn* “pen (of animals)” = CA *banna-tu* fem. id.

41. ON. *bein* “bone”, OHG. *bein* “bone, leg”, OE. *bān* “bone”; CA *bawāni* pl. “rib bone”, Egyp. *bwn* “claw, talon, nail”.

42. OCS. *karbljĭ* “boat”, Cz. *karab* id. (?): CA *ḳāribu* id.

43. OCS. and common Slav. *ryba* “fish” (?): CA *rby* in *’i-rbiya-nu* “a kind of fish”, Egyp. *rp’* “fish”.

44. Ir. *bab* “baby, girl”, MHG. *buobe* “boy”, OCz. *babē* “little girl”, ON. *bofi* “knave”, Sw. *bov* id. = Akk. *bibū* “baby”, Aram. *byb’* id., CA *babb-at* “small child”.

45. OE. *brōc* “brook”, OHG. *bruah* “marsh” = Sab *brkt*, CA *birkah*, Heb. *birēkā*, Ug. *brk* “pool, cistern”.

46. Goth. *aribaiþs* “to work” = CA *’ariba* “be skillful”.

47. Corn. *gonys* “to work”, Ir. *gnū* “to do, make”, Br. *gounit* “to cultivate, gain, earn” = Egyp. *gnḥ* “to work, to toil under order”.

48. Lat. *barōnis* “man” > Spanish *varon* “man”, French *baron* “baron”, in OFrench “husband”, etc., wrongly assumed to be «*fr. a Germ. word meaning orig. “fighting man”* (in ON. *perjask* “fight”), *where “man”, “retainer”, etc.*» (SS: §221).

CA *barnasā* (*barnašā*), obsol. for several centuries, “man”, an Aram. compound of *bar* “son” (Aram. *bar* id.) and *’nš* “man” (Aram. *’nš* id.): Aram. *br (’)nš* “man, human being”, orig. “son of man” (for a parallel: CA *bin ’ādamu* “son of Adam” > “man, human being”). Thus it becomes evident that Lat. *baronis* is borrowed directly from CA. For ON. *perjask* “fight”: *perja* “to stike, beat”: Egyp. *pr* “battle”; *pr-t* “battle-field”: see §3.8.81 above.

49. Lat. *nōbilis* “noble” is, according to EM, 677, fr. *\*gnōbilis*, a deriv. of *\*gnōscere* “to know” > *nōscere*, and the original form is seen in *ignōbilis* “ignoble”. They also suppose that the original meaning of the word was ‘*known*’, since it is fr. *nōscere* “to know”, but later “noble of birth”.

This analysis of Lat. *nōbilis* is wrong and misleading. In following it, we would make the *wrong analysis* of deriving Lat. *nōmen* “name”, for instance, from *\*gnōmen* on the

wrong assumption that the initial \*g- is preserved intact in \*ignōminia “ignominy”. *Wrong as this analysis is of Lat. nōmen, it is equally wrong EM’s analysis of Lat. nōbilis.* The word is from CA nabīlu “noble of birth”.

50. Lat. arbor “tree” = CA ‘araba-tu “kind of tree”, from an extension of [‘ar-], in CA ‘ar‘ar “juniper”, Egyp. ‘r “a kind of shrub” as a vb “to rise”: see §3.12.30 above.

The CA word above shares with that of Lat. a stem [‘ar-], but is not an exact cognate since the -b- of Lat. arbor is from \*/d/ or \*/dh/: cf. Lat. arduus “high, steep”, Ir. ard “high, tall”, etc.

The HS cognate is the root in CA ‘arada “to rise, raise, grow; elevated, upright, high”; ‘arada-tu fem. “kind of tree”, with m-extension: ‘ardamu “trunk of a tree”, etc.

51. Grk saroō “to sweep” = Egyp. s-šr caus. “to sweep out, clean out”.

52. Lat. sāga “witch” = Egyp. syg “foolish man”.

53. Lat. sēmita “path” = CA samtu “road, path”: samata “to head to”, Egyp. smd “to walk”.

54. Ir. srōn “nose” = perh. Egyp. šr “nose”.

55. OCS. syrû “cheese”, Lith. sūris id., suras “salted”, Bulg. sir, Pol. ser “cheese”, OE, OHG. sūr “sour”, etc. = Egyp. sr, sl “cheese, butter”.

56. Lat. amita “aunt”, ON. amma “grandmother” = CA ‘ammatu “aunt”; ‘ammu, Akk. āmmu “paternal uncle”.

57. Av. mervi- “strife” = Egyp. mrḥ’ id.

58. Grk múron “perfume, ointment” (?) < Egyp. mrḥw “the god of perfume”; mrḥ-t “oil, unguent, grease”.

59. Grk mastós “breast”, Ionic mazós = Egyp. mst-t “breast”.

60. Lat. summus “highest, topmost” = CA sumuw-wu “height, loftiness”.

61. W. ma “place” = CA ma “place”.

62. Lat. amāre “to love” = Egyp. ‘mr “to love”: both have the caus. /’a-/.

63. Lith. wairas “rudder” = Egyp. wer id.

64. Lat. verrēs “boar” (?): Egyp. wr “pig”.

65. Av. varəka- “leaf” = CA waraḫa-tu fem. id., Heb. yrḳ “green herbage, herbs, grass”, Sab. wrḳ “vegetable crops”, etc. §3.6.46 above.

66. Lat. mēnsa “table” = Egyp. mst id.

67. Grk pímprēmi, fut. pēso “to kindle”, Russ. prěju “to sweat, stew”: PIE \*prēyō-. (IECD, 984; WP II, 27) = Egyp. pr-t “outbreak of fire”.

68. Lat. bucca “cheek”, W. boch id., Br. boc’h id.: IE \*bhu-. (SS: §4.208, IECD, 56; WP. II. 113ff) = Egyp. b’ḳs-t “cheek” also bws-w “cheeks”. Also belong here Lith. bučiuoti “to kiss”, Lat. bāsiāre id., Alb. buzë “lip”, Ir. bus id., etc.

69. IE: OE. sand “sand”, OHG sant, ON sandr id. Buck (SS: §1.215) connects the Grm. words with Lat. sabulum id. and derives them from PIE \*samdho- = CA samīdu “semolina, fine flour” (look like *sand*), Egyp. smd “antimony, kohl”.

70. Latv. sarkans “red”, sarks “slightly red”: CA šariḳu “red, reddish” (§2.19.2 above).

71. IE: Lith. kurtinas “deaf”, OCS krūnŭ “having a mutilated ear or nose”, Skt. karṇa- “short-eared” (SS: §4.95) = CA ḳarma-tu “a small piece of the *ear* or *nose* (of animal) is cut as a distinguishing mark”, Chad.: Housa kurma “deaf”. As a vb: CA ḳrm, ḳrṫm.

72. Goth. and common Grm. stainas “stone”, OCS. stěna “wall”, Grk. stía “pebble” = Egyp. st “stone”; st-t “wall”: perh. Ug. št, CA satā “to weave”.

73. OCS večerŭ “evening”, Lat. vesper Lith. vakaras id. = Egyp. yšr “evening” id.

74. Lat. sordēs “filth”, sordidus “dirty”, swāsum “dark color”, Goth. swarts “black”, OE. sweart id. (SS: §15.65; EM, 958, 991) = CA sawād “blackness, darkness”; ’a-swad “black, dark color”.

75. Goth. and common Grm. niman “to take” = Egyp. nm’ “strong”.

76. Hitt. tepu “small” = CA ṭafīf “small, little”.

77. ON. tala “to speak”, OE. tellan “to tell, to count”, OHG. zellan “to relate, tell, count” = CA talā may render “to read, recite”, in some contexts ‘to read, e.g. *the Koran*, or *recite*, e.g. *poetry*, to audience. The actual signification of CA talā is *to tell s.o. about s.t. through reading or reciting it*.

78. OIr. saith “evil” (IE \*sat-) = Egyp. s’-t id.; St “the god of evil”, CA sū’ “bad, evil”, with t-, d- exts (becoming parts of the root): sattu “evil (words)”, saddu “shame”.

79. OCS. duchŭ, Russ. dychanie “breath”, Lith. dvėsti “to expire, die”, Latv. dvaša “breath”, = Egyp. tw, twy “breath” ~ θy “breath, respiration”.

80. Skt. khād- “to chew”, a cpd of [ka’-] (see §2.17.83 above) + ad- “eat”.

81. Lat. digitus “finger” = CA duġatu “three fingers”, i.g. *the first three digits*, starting with the first, i.e. *thumb*.

82. OCS. dabŭ “tree”, Russ. dub, Pol. dab, etc. “oak” = CA dabru “a tree very similar to an oak-tree”.

### 3.19 IE-HS Grammatical Systems: DERIVATIONAL AND INFLECTIONAL AFFIXES

Grammar is the scientific study of the *morphology* and *syntax* of a language; morphology studies the structure of words, including *word-formation*, *derivation* and *inflection*, while *syntax* studies the way words are combined to form phrases and sentences and the *rules* governing such combinations<sup>312</sup>. The importance of syntax is greater in languages that are poor in inflectional affixes than in languages in which inflectional affixes play a considerable meaningful part. In an uninflected language like Chinese, for example, word order serves to express grammatical relations so that any change in the order of words in a sentence will change its meaning or make it meaningless. But in inflected languages like CA and Lat., word order has little or no bearing upon meaning and is not therefore utilized to express a difference in meaning. It is immaterial in what order the words ‘girl sees wolf’ are arranged because ‘girl’, as a subject of the sentence, carries a /-u/ ending in CA and /-a/ ending in Latin, while the object ‘wolf’ is marked with /-a/ ending in CA and /-um/ ending in Lat.

All IE and HS languages are inflective, which is to say that their grammatical systems are based on modifications in the forms of stems (or roots) by means of vowel changes and affixes to express such grammatical relations as *number*, *case*, *tense* and *person*. In such synthetic languages, where inflections indicate grammatical relationships, *syntax* becomes secondary and is immediately dependent upon *morphology*. For this reason, the term grammar will be confined here to *morphology*.

**3.19.1 Word-formation.** The earliest method of word-formation in *all languages* is ‘*compounding*’, whereby two proots are joined together to form a new word, later on ‘*derivation*’, again in *all languages*. Our study of various HS compounds throughout Chapter II above also applies to their IE cognates as well as to any world’s language. The overwhelming majority of words studied in this Chapter are compounds. For example, Skt. monosyllabic du- “to burn” in §3.6.25 above is a compound consisting of two separate proots [da’] “make, cause” and [’au] “fire”.

#### 3.19.2 Derivational Suffixes

IE surface affixes, as described by Indoeuropeanists, are usually suffixes, while HS affixes can be prefixes and/or suffixes with few infixes. Nearly all HS affixes are simple, whereas most of the IE originally simple suffixes have an additional suffixes added to them. As **a general rule**: *any linguistic element suffixed to a word to modify its meaning without changing its part of speech (as in English green-greenish, friend-friendship, and the like) or change its syntactic class (as in English large-enlarge) can often be used as a prefix with the same function.*

---

<sup>312</sup> For my view on ‘syntax’, see §2.17.51, under *Comments* above.

What follows is a very brief discussion of IE-HS cognate suffixes, where the emphasis is only upon the traditionally recognized IE affixes. All IE newly discovered affixes in this Chapter such as *ša’-*, *da’-*, *ka’-*, *ga’-*, *ma-*, *t-*, *-t-*, *-n-*, *-r-*, and so on will be excluded to avoid *repetition*.

**3.19.2.1** IE *-t-*, denoting the ‘*person occupied or connected with*’ as in Grk *náutēs*, Lat. *nauta* “sailor”: Skt. *nāu-* “ship” (cf. CG: §484). Skt. *cluto-* “one connected with hearing”, *sūta-* “charioteer” (‘*driver*’, *one connected with* \**sū-t* “driving”, from *sū-*, *suvti*), *nāpita-* “barber”: SL, 167.

HS \**-t-* as in CA *nūtī* “sailor”: Ug. *nyt* “ship”, fr. \**nw-t* as in Egyp. *n’-t* “ship”. To my understanding, CA final *-tī* is a compound of *-t-* and *[-ī]*, i.e. *[-y]* “belonging to”. It is the very same *[-y]* in *ġabalī* “belonging to the mountain”, *lubnānī* “Lebanese”, etc. The full form in a sentence is nom. *nūtiyy-un*, *ġabaliyy-un*, *lubnāniyy-un*. As for *[-t-]*, it may form *[nau-]* “swing, go to and fro” or a direct derivative of *[nau-]* “water”, etc. Egyp. *s-yp-tī* “inspector”, apparently based on *s-yp-t* (§3.19.2.1c below): *s-yp* “to inspect”.

The same suffix can also occur as a prefix CA *ti-lmīd* “pupil”: Sem. *lmδ* “to learn”: comp. the prefix with that of Grk *μαθητής* “pupil” fr. *μανθάνω* “to learn”, etc.

3.19.2.1a IE *-tāt-* forms abstract nouns from adjectives and nouns (*-tūs*, *tūtis*, *tūdo*, *tūdinis*, with the same force) as in Lat. *bonitās* “goodness”: *bonus* “good”, Grk *νεότης* “youth”: *νεός* “young”, Hitt. *kartimmiatt-* “anger”, *duškaratt* “joy”. *Such nouns have normally acquired the feminine gender*: Skt. *nakt-* “night”, Lat. *nox* id., *salūs*, *quiēs*, etc. see SL: §14; CG: §476.

HS: CA *ṭaiyibu* “good” > *ṭībatu* “goodness”, *wasīmu* “handsome” > *wasāmatu*, Ug. *ysmt* “beauty”, Eth. *šanāyt* “beauty”: *šanāy* “beautiful”, Assy. *ṭab-tu* “goodness”, etc. O’Leary, 1969: §113, CA *‘izzatu*: *‘izzu* “glory”, *ru’yatu* “vision”: *ra’ā* “see”, *sa’āda-tu* “happiness”, etc. all are feminine, Egyp. *mr-tt* “wilderness, desert land”: *mr* “desert”, etc.

The same suffix can also occur as a prefix: comp. Ug. *tsm* “beauty”.

3.19.2.1b IE *-to-* forms abstract nouns from verbs as in Grk *φότος* “load”: *φέρω* “bear”, Lat. *lautus* “neat”: *lavō* “to wash”, etc. CG: §482, n. 4.

HS: CA *‘azīma-tu* “resolution”: *‘azama* “to resolve”, Egyp. *mr-t* “love”: *mr* “to love”.

3.19.2.1c IE *-ti-* also *-tu-*, *mostly in verbal abstract with few agents*, as in Skt. *gati-* “going, gait”: *gam-* “go”, *mati-* “thought, mind”: *man-* “think”, Lat. *actio* “action”: *agō* “do, act”, etc. CG: §§485, 486, 487.

HS: Egyp. *s-yp-t* “inspection”: *s-yp* “to inspect”; *ḥwīt* “beating”: *ḥwī* “to beat”, *sgrt* “silence”: *s-gr* “make silent”, CA *rība-tu* “doubt”: *rāba* “to doubt”, *salāma-tu* “safety”: *salima* “be safe”.

Egyp. *bh-t* “what is born”: *bh* “give birth”. To my understanding, Egyp. final */-t/* is the same as Sem. */t-/* in §2.7.24 above. For more information on HS affix */t/*, see §§2.7 & 2.9 above.

3.19.2.1.d IE and HS also use suffixed /-t-/ to form nouns denoting rank or office (CG: §475, n. 3): For HS /-t-/, see §2.9 above.

#### Comments

As has been explained throughout Chapter II above: *any derivational affix has in the course of millennia become an inseparable part of the word in some or all of its occurrences in the entire IE and HS languages. As a suffix, /-t-/ is of course no exception: see, for example, §3.10.56 above.*

**3.18.2.2** IE -s-, a neuter suffix, as in Skt. *apas-* “work”, Lat. *apus* “toil” (SL), Grk *kártos*, *krátos* “strength” (CG: § 507; SL: §13).

HS -š- as in CA *’afsu* “toil”, Akk. *epša-tu* “action, deed”; CA *ḫardasa-tu* “strength”: Akk. *ḫrd* “be strong”. For much information on HS /-s/, see §2.1.6.9, esp. n. 1a-1m, and n. 2 above.

**3.19.2.3** IE -r- as in Lat. *vir*, Skt. *vīra-* “man” (CG: §470).

HS -r- as in Egyp. *’wr* “man”: *’w* “to be”, CA *’au* ~ *’ai* id. For all needed information on HS /-r/, see §2.1.6.7 above.

**3.19.2.4** IE -ni-, -nu- as in Lat. *ignis* “fire”, Skt. *agni-* (CG: §465).

HS \*-n- as in Ug. *’gn* “fire”: CA *’aḡḡa* “to ignite a fire”.

3.19.2.4a IE -no- forms adjectives and nouns from verbs as in Lat. *plēnus* “full”: *-pleō* “fill”, *dignus* “worthy”: *decet* “is fitting”, *δεινός* “fearful”: *δέδοικα* “to fear”, Grk *τέκνον* “child”: *τίκτω* “bear”, etc. CG: §464; Meillet, *Introd.* 225-226.

HS: Assy. *dulhānu* “confusion”: *dalāhu* “to confuse”, CA *mal’ānu* “full”: *mala’a* “to fill”, *’aṣṣānu* “thirsty”: *’aṣṣa* “be thirsty”, *ḡalayānu* “boiling”: *ḡalā* “to boil”, *sulṭānu* “king, power”, OffAram., Palm. *šlṭn’*, Pun. *šlṭn* “power, control”: *šlṭ* “exercise power over”, CA *burhān* “proof”, Sab. *brhn* “testimony” (cf. §2.11, n. 1), Heb., Aram. *dkrn* “memory”: CA *ḡakara* “to remember”, Eth. *tekūrān* “black”, etc. O’Leary, 1969: §118. For prefixed /n-/, see §2.11, n. 8 above.

3.19.2.4b Egyp. *ḥwī-ní* “a beater”. The suffix signifies ‘*connected with (beating)*’: *ḥwī* “to beat” and *-ní* “belonging to”. It is ult. related to that of Lat. *fāginus* “of beech”: *fāgus* “beech”, Grk. *λίθivos* “of stone”, etc.

**3.19.2.5** IE -m- as in Lat. *armus* “shoulder”, Goth. *arms* “arm”; Skt. *dru-mah* “tree”, Grk *δρυ-μά* “forest” (CG: §460; Meillet, *Introd.* 227; HCG, §109).

PHS \*-m- as in CA *’urumu* “fingertips”, Egyp. *’rmn* (see §3.15.23 above).

The suffix, whether it is simple or compound, still has other grammatical functions in IE as in the formation of participles and various nouns as in Hitt. *te-it-hi-ma-aš* “thunder”, Skt. *garmaś* “heat”, etc. These and many other functions are performed in HS by the suffix /m/. It is also common, esp. in CA, in the formation of nouns, adjectives, as



in *bul'ūm* “pharynx”: *bala'a* “to swallow”; *ḥulḳūm* “throat”: *ḥalku* “palate, throat”, etc., and prefixed /-m/ in the formation of participles among many others, e.g. *ma-ktūbu* “written”: *kataba* “to write”, etc. see §2.10 above.

### 3.19.2.6 IE -wo- forms adjectives and some nouns (CG: §458).

HS /-w/ forms nouns as in Egyp. *bbw* “strong man”: *bb* “be violent”, *bn* “male, man”: *bn* “to copulate”, *snnw* “image, likeness”: *sn* “copy” and “make a copy”.

There are very few archaic adjectives formed with /-w/ in CA as in *sinda'wu* [r. *snd'*] “courageous”. The suffix is more common in the formation of nouns, esp. *those referring to 'small or little one or thing'*. See §2.12, n. 5 and 7 above.

A more common suffix is the compound -wā-nu/-t, a cpd of /-wu/ and /-nu/ or /-tu/, as in *'undu-wānu* “evil”, *ḥunzu-wā-tu* ~ *ḥunzu-wā-nu* “insolence”, *samā-wa-tu* “self, same”: *sima-tu* “mark of distinction”, etc.

### 3.19.2.7 IE -eyo- forms adjectives, as in Skt. *pitriya-*, Lat. *patrius* “paternal”, Ved. *damiya-* “domestic” (*dam-* “home”), *gavya-* “pertaining to cows” (*gav-* “cow”), etc. and adjectives denoting material as in Lat. *aureus* “golden”: *aurum* “gold”, etc. CG: §456; Meillet, *Introd.* 224.

All such functions are expressed by HS /-y/, whose basic meaning is ‘belonging to, source from, made from/of, coming from, connected with, etc.’ as in CA *'abawiy* “paternal”, *baḳariy* “pertaining to cows” (< *baḳar* “cows”), *ḍahabiy* “golden or of gold”: *ḍahabu* “gold”, *ḥaḡariy* “stony, made of stone, of stone”: *ḥaḡaru* “stone”, *yadawiy* “manual”, etc. see §2.6, esp. n. 7 above.

#### Comments I

Consider carefully the following examples from CA:

a) *ma'ī* “I have”, but lit. *in my hand*: *ma-* = with/in, *-'* “hand”, and *-ī* = gen. sg., i.e. “my”, but we can't say *\*ma'iya*. With other possessive pronouns, one may say: dial. *ma'āk* “you masc. sg. have”, *ma'ākum* (you mas. pl. have”, etc.: CA *ma'ak*, *ma'akum* respectively. The dial. long /-ā-/ seems to be a reflex of /-iya-/.

b) *lī* “for me”, fr. *l* “for” and *-ī*. We can say *liyā*.

c) *kitābī* “my book”. We can say *kitābiyā*.

d) *'alayyā* “I must, I should”, lit. *on me*.

e) *'ummī* “my mother”, *'ummīyā* is acceptable; *'abī* “my father”, but never *\*'abiyā*. This is why old Arab scholars assumed that /-t-/ of *'abati* “my father” is used instead of /-y-/: see §2.9, n. c above.

The gen. sg. above is in Heb. *-ī-*, *-ē-*, Aram. *-i-*, Eth. *-e-*, etc. In Lat. *-ī-* as in *lupī*, Celtic. *-ī-*, in Skt. *-ī-* in compounds as in *stambhī-bhū* “become a post”. CG: §239, n. 2.

The origin of the suffix may be from either:

a) *-ī-* is a gen. case of [*'u*] “I” as in Akk. *-ya*, *-i*, CA *-ya*, *-ī*, Ug. (*-y*), Eth. *-ya*, Heb. *-ī* (Moscati, 1969: §13.14). Therefore, it *may* be etymologically different from /-ī-/ *belonging to*, etc. (§2.22.2 above)

b)  $\bar{i}$ -, i.e. [-y-], is ult. the same as [-y-] *belonging to*, etc. above. Note that in all examples cited in §3.19.2.7 above, [-y-] can also be pronounced as  $\bar{i}$ -. 'abawī, ḏahabī, ḥaḡarī, yadawī, etc. *all words in the language*, and that, as one should expect, / $\bar{i}$ -/ > /-i-/ when [-y-] is pronounced. In following this point of view, we can say that the gen. sg. ending / $\bar{i}$ -/ also appears in other IE languages such as Skt. *vr̥kasya* = Lat. *lupī* above.

The problem with [-y] is not over and will never be. This same [-y] may also be used to express 'one who does anything', i.e. *agent noun* (= connected with), as in CA ḡauhariy "one who makes, repairs, or deals in jewelry", i.e. *jeweler*. To my understanding, the signification of the word is not different from 'one used to do s.t.', i.e. *to make jewels*. At this crucial point of discussion the reader is requested to go back to section §2.24.18, n. a above and re-read it carefully. Otherwise, what follows may not be evident.

The term 'one' in 'one used to do s.t.' above can be replaced by 'thing or object', i.e. *a thing is utilized to do s.t.* In other words, *the instrument*.

The *inst. idea* is expressed in HS by prefixed [mi-], orig. = "by, with"<sup>313</sup>, as in CA miftāḥ "key" (for both cognates and more examples, see §2.10 & §2.24.17 above). Since *bi* also expresses "by, with, etc.", we wonder why HS peoples have not used it as '*inst. case*' along with *mi*-.

IE expresses the inst. sg. and pl. of esp.  $\bar{a}$ -,  $\bar{i}$ -, and u-stems by *a form of /-mi/*, *a form of /-bhi/*, or *a form ult. fr. [ $\bar{i}$ -, i.e. -y-]*. The same case /-bhi-/ also extends to express ablative and dative plurals (CG: §§229ff; SL: Chapter V; Fortson, 2004: §§6.45-657).

## Comments II

The foregoing discussion compels me to conclude that grammatical cases had been developed in inflectional languages long after the full establishment of 'compounding', 'derivation', and 'system of prepositions', and that almost all cases, esp. *inst.*, *loc.*, *abl.*, *gen.*, *dat.*, *illative*, *adessive*, *allative*, *inessive*, *superessive*, *terminative*, and many others found in inflectional languages *originate from prepositions*. The following examples may be sufficient to illustrate the point<sup>314</sup>:

1) Hitt. employs a suffix /-l/ to mark the gen. of the personal pronouns as in gen. sg. *ammēl* "my", *anzēl* "our", *tuēl* "thy", etc. The same suffix is also found in Etruscan and a trace of it is preserved in Lat. *erīlis fīlius* "master's son" (HCG: §199).

In accordance with *the general rule* as stated in §3.19.2 above, the HS cognate is the /l/ seen in CA la-nā (-nā = *us*) "for us, ours", la-hā *five children* (hā = *her*) "she has five children", and so forth.

2) However, the gen. pl. of the 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. pl. is -n in Hitt. *šumenzan* id. The same suffix is also found in Grk as in *ummōn* id., Aeolic *ámmōn* "our", etc. = Egyp. *ní* *a mark of the gen. sg.*; nw (fr. *ní* plus pl. -w) *a mark of the gen. pl.*: [n] *belonging to* (for an example, see §3.19.2.4b above), CA gen.-acc. pl. -yīn (Wright, 1962: §3.8).

<sup>313</sup> Egyp. *m* = *out from, with, from, at, into*, etc. see §2.10, n. 6b above.

<sup>314</sup> See, for example, §3.3.72, n. d above.

Accordingly, it is useless and worthless to use ‘cases’ as a criterion for establishing genetic relationships between languages. This particular point has already been discussed in §2.25, n. 9d above.

**3.19.2.8** IE -ā- (-o-) forms feminine of adjectives and nouns, abstract and action nouns, e.g. Skt. *bāla* “masc. ‘boy’”; *bālā* “girl”, *ācva-* “horse, stallion”; *ācvā-* “mare”, *āja-* “he-goat”; *ajā* fem. “goat”; *diśa* “direction” (*diś-* “show”), *kṣāmā* “patience”, *rasā* “moisture”, OCS *rosa*, Lith. *rosà* “dew” (SL: §18).

HS: The suffix that can do the above functions is [-ā’-] as in CA *ḥasnā* “beautiful”: masc. *ḥasan*; *balhā* “idiot (woman)”: masc. *’a-blahu* or *balihu*, *’amyā* “blind”: masc. *’a-’mā*. Nouns ending with [-ā’-] are syntactically fem., e.g. *nakbā* “calamity”, *ḍarrā* “adversity” with no corresponding masc. forms., *bayḍā* “hatred”, etc.

A similar suffix in function is /-ā/ as in CA *ḍikrā* “memory”, *da’wā* “a claim”, *ru’yā* “vision”, etc.

Most other consonantal suffixes found in IE such as /-l, -d, -g, k, etc./ have already been dealt with their HS corresponding suffixes in *chapter II* above.

### 3.19.3 Inflectional Affixes

#### 3.19.3.1 Number

At a stage so immensely old when the inflectional systems of many language families, including IE and HS, had been in their early age of existence, there were *three ancient methods* of indicating plurality. Visible traces of one or more of such methods are still found in all language families including HS and IE.

3.18.3.1a The first method employs *complete or full reduplication*, i.e. *the repetition of the entire word* as in Walpiri, an Australian language, *kurdu* “child” > *kurdukurdu* “children”. To this type of reduplication belong Luganda *bar* “two” > *barbar* “all two”, Mandarin Chinese *ren* “man” > *renren* “everybody”, Malay *anak* “child” > *anakanak* “various children”, Indonesian *oraṅ* “man” > *oraṅoraṅ* “all sorts of men”, Agta, a language of the Philippines, *takki* “leg” > *taktakki* “legs”<sup>315</sup>, Amele, an Australian language, *ben* “big” > *ben ben* “many big things”, Tamil, a Dravidian language, *ad adu* “each and every thing”, *avang avanga* “all kinds of different people”. Visible traces of this method are found in HS: see below.

On the other hand, many languages use *complete reduplication* for different purposes such as:

a) *to express an intensive meaning* as in Shi, a Bantu language, *nyeeru* “white” > *nyeerunyeeru* “very white”, Polynesian, an Austronesian language, *paki* “to pat” > *pakipaki* “to pat frequently”, Telugu, a Dravidian language, *pedda* “large” > *pedda*

<sup>315</sup> For more information, see Katamba, 1993: §§9.2-9.3.2 and Štekauer, Pavol; Valera, Salvador, and Körtvélyessy, Livia. 2012.

pedda “very large”, Tibetan ldum “round” > ldum ldum “very round”, Amele nag “small” > nag nag “very small” also “many small things”,

b) to express *diminutive meaning* as in Thai *xóyamac* “child” > *xoyamacxóyamac* “small child”, Polynesian *manu* “a bird, small insect” > *manumanu* “a very small insect”, etc.

c) to express a *multiple, frequentative, or repetitive action*: see Štekauer, Pavol; Valera, Salvador, and Körtvélyessy, Livia. 2012: §1.1.3.3.

All such uses are later developments of reduplicated pl. nouns and adjectives and found in HS (§2.1.14.2 above).

Examples of *complete reduplication* in IE are Ved. *rériha* “licking repeatedly”, Skt. *bhar-ī-bhar-ti* 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. “carry continually”, OCS *glagolati* (\*gal-gal) “to speak” (cf. §3.4.11 above). The most common type of partial reduplication is the repetition of the 1<sup>st</sup> syllable as in Skt. *bi-bhar* “carry”, *dē-dić-* “show, point out”, *nenekti* 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. “wash”, *pāpatīti* “fall”, Hitt. *ha-aš-ha-aš-ša-an* “opened”, etc. Szemerényi, 1990: §9.4.1.2; Fortson, 2004: §§4.20, 5.24, 6.41, 6.63; HCG: §216, SL, 354-356.

For a deep and comprehensive study of total reduplication and all types of partial reduplication in HS, see §2.1.14.2 above. The section also tells about the origin of reduplicated verbs and all types of reduplication.

3.19.3.1b The next ancient method is the *internal modification of vowels*, i.e. *broken plural*. This is quite common in CA as in *ġibāl* the pl. of *ġabal* “mountain”, *ḏi’āb*, pl. of *ḏi’b* “wolf” and is also found in Egyp. and Sem. (see §2.3.40, under *Comments* above). Hitt. also preserved this type as in *widār*, pl. of *watar* “water”.

Broken plurals are expressed by a number of different surface stems, of which we have so far seen two in CA, namely *CaCaC* > pl. *CiCāC* and *CiCC* > pl. *CiCāC*. Some others, as illustrations, *CaCC* > *CiCāC* (*kalb* “dog” > *kilāb*), *CaCūC* > *CuCuC* (*rasūl* “messenger” > *rusul*), *CuCC-* > *CuCā* (*munya-tu* fem. “a wish” > *munā*), etc. Hitt., too, confirms that ‘*broken plurals*’ are not limited to one pattern or stem, hence *alpeš*, pl. of *alpaš* “cloud”. We may add here Lat. *locus* “place”, pl. *locī*, coll. *loca*.

3.19.3.1c The plural form is indistinguishable from the singular, i.e. *the use of the singular as plural without any change*, as in Modern English *sheep*. This method has survived in a few CA nouns as *raġamu* “friend/friends” and in Ved., e.g. *ūdhar* *divyāni* “divine udders”, *yojanā puru* “many leagues”, etc. Burrow (SL, 236) considers this type as «*a survival from an early stage when the inflectional system was less developed*».

### 3.19.3.2 *Dual*

The dual marker is expressed in HS by the following CA dual endings:

a) nom. -ān: -ā, as in CA *kitāb-ān*, *kitāb-ā*,

b) acc. -ain: -ai (or ay), as in CA *kitāb-ain*, *kitāb-ay*

The choice of any of the above pairs of ending is a purely *syntax* matter. All are from \*’ā or \*’ai in Egyp. *y-* added either to the pl. -w or to the fem. -t: comp. CA *bintu* “girl” > *bintā* or *bintān* “two girls”: masc. bin.

Traces of the dual ending are seen in Eth. -ē (*edē* “both hands” before suffixes only),

in Heb. -ay (yaday “two hands”), etc. see O’Leary, 1969: §125.

This is the same dual form seen in the personal pronouns as in humā “they both” ([hu] = “he”, [-m-] = pl. ending, and [-ā], possessive pronouns (e.g. baitu-ku-m-ā), demonstratives, adjectives, verbs (e.g. katabā = “they both wrote”): see §2.22.2 above.

It is also the same dual ending seen in IE nouns as in Ved. dev-ā “two gods”, OCS grad-a “two cities”, etc. Fortson, 2004: §650.

### 3.19.3.3 Comparison of Adjectives

IE has two comparative suffixes: \*-yes- and \*-tero- also \*-ero-, and two superlative suffixes: \*-isto-, the weak grade of \*-yes, with suffix \*-to, and \*-mo- (~ \*tmo-). CG: 291ff; Fortson, 2004: §§6.78-6.81; Szemerényi, 1990: §7.8.1ff.

HS comparative and superlative affixes have already been studied in depth in §§2.19-2.19.4 above. It is also very important to see §3.14.11, n. 1 above. All what I should add here is that CA also has a *feminine superlative suffix* [-y-] as in *kubrā* “the eldest”, *ṣuyrā* “the youngest”, *’uḏmā* “the greatest”. It is amazing that comparative and superlative affixes discussed in §2.19ff above do not show any distinction of gender. The presence of fem. [-y-] in CA strongly suggests the earlier presence of two sets of comparative and superlative affixes: *masc.* and *fem.* See §2.14.1, n. 1 above.

**3.19.3.4** The linguistic forms dealt with in the foregoing section represent fairly late innovations in IE and HS and are only important as indicators of the linguistic elements which had started to develop before the break up of their unity. There are still many similar forms belonging to this period, a *few* of them are:

3.19.3.4.1 The future affix /s/ is seen in HS as a prefix and in IE as a suffix. On the side of HS, the prefix is preserved intact in CA *sa-* as in *sa-’a-ktubu* lit. “shall I write, i.e. *I shall write*”; on the side of IE in Lith. *-si-* as in *duo-siu* “I shall give”, Skt. *-sy* as in *dā-sy-āti* “he will give”, Av. *-sya-* as in *vaxšyā* “I will say”, OIr. *-s-* as in *seiss* (\*sed-s-ti) “will sit”, Grk (Dor.) *σω, σει*, in early Lat. and Osc-Umbr. *-s-* (SL: §9; CG: §388; Szemerényi, 1990: §9.4.2.2; CCG: §456, n. c).

3.19.3.4.2 Another linguistic form is the affix /n/, seen, as we should often expect, as a *prefix* in HS and as a *suffix* in IE. However, the occurrence of this affix as a *suffix* in HS is not rare. The earliest grammatical function of the suffix is *reflexive* in HS, later *causative* in *some* of its occurrences.

On the side of IE, the suffix in question serves as *caus.* as in Hitt. *hu-iš-nu-zi* “cause to live”, *aš-nu-zi* “cause to sit”, *ar-nu-zi* “cause to move”, Skt. *ṛṇti* 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. “moves”, Grk *órṇūmi* “cause to rise” (HCG: §228ff) = CA *na’aša* “enliven”: *’āša* “live”. For suffixed -n in HS, see §2.11 above.

3.19.3.4.3 An affix /r/ serves to form a particular type of ‘*passive voice*’. As we should expect, the affix is used in HS as a *prefix* and in IE as a *suffix*. On the side of IE, it is most common in Celtic and in Lat. as in OIr. *berair* “is brought”, and found in other IE languages as Hitt., Av., Osc., etc. (Szemerényi 1990: §9.2.2.2). Traces of this PHS

prefix are preserved in CA and Egyp.: see, for example, §2.11.6, n. 3 above along with the *Comments*.

3.19.3.4.4 Among other grammatical morphemes, which occur as suffixes in IE but prefixes in HS, is the imperative affix /l/. Sturtevant and Hahn (HCG: §258) state that «*the rare imperative first singular of both (Hitt.) conjugations usually ends in llu after a vowel stem or in allu after a consonant stem*; e.g. *pi-iš-ki-el-lu* “I will give”, *me-ma-al-lu* “I will speak”... *From eš- “be” we have also e-eš-lu-ut and e-eš-li-it*».

The imperative stem is formed in CA in a number of different ways depending on the type of the root as well as on the imperfect stem<sup>316</sup>, e.g. *’uktub* [ktb] “write!”, *sāfir* [sfr] “travel!”, *’irmi* [rmy] “drop!”, *ḵum* [ḵwm] “rise!”<sup>317</sup>, *ḵi* [wḵy] “protect!”. All are understood as 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. masc. sg. The feminine counterpart is formed by suffixing -i: *sāfiri* “travel!” and plural by suffixing the pl. marker -w, i.e. -ū: *’uktubū* “write!”.

Old Grammarians state as a rule that the imperative is formed by *dropping the prefixed pers. pron.*, called *ḥarf al muḍāra’ah* = *imperfect marker* (taḵūm “you masc. sg. rise” > ḵum!), and that it *must be capable of taking a suffix -nn*, called *nūn of confirmation*, e.g. *’uktubanna* “write!” (called by Semitists *energetic -nūn*).

The imperative first person *cannot be expressed without prefixing /l/*, called *l of ’amr*, i.e. *l of imperative*. With this /l/ the prefixed pers. pron. or *ḥarf al muḍāra’ah*, is kept, e.g. *linaktub* “let us write!”, *naktub* “we write”, *li’andur* “let me look”: *’andur* “I look, see”, and as in the Koran: *litandur nafsun ...* (59: 18), *Let every soul look ...* Two facts should be born in mind:

i) The use of *l of imperative* without dropping the inflectional prefix may be evidence that /l/ was orig. used as a suffix.

ii) It is possible that /l/ had been first used with one person (1<sup>st</sup> pers.), and that was later spread to all other persons, e.g. *liyara* “let him see!”, *litara* “let you (masc. sg.) see!”, *linara* “let we see!”, *liyarū* “let them see!”, etc.

A form *’alā* can express ‘*a wish + imperative*’, i.e. *the whole meaning is imperative*, as in the PIP of Imri’ Al Qais:

’alā ’aiyuhā (’a)l lailu (’a)ṭ ṭawīlu ’alā nḡali...

3.19.3.4.5 The gender in IE and HS is *grammatical*. Nearly all IE languages make a grammatical distinction of three genders: *masculine, feminine, and neuter*, whereas Hitt. has two genders: *masculine*, corresponding to the IE *masculine* and *feminine*, and *neuter*, corresponding to the IE neuter. However, the difference between *the masculine* and *the neuter* is slight. The latter has a distinctive form only for the nom.-acc. Otherwise it has the same endings as the masculine. Moreover, «*the masculine and feminine have the same form in many classes of nouns, adjectives, and the interrogative indefinite pronoun, etc.*» (CG: §226). Szemerényi (1999: §7.1.2) sees that

*«The Indo-European system of three genders must, however,*

<sup>316</sup> For example, *’uktub!* is from CI *yaktubu* “he writes”, while *sāfir!* is from CIII *yusāfiru* “he travels”.

<sup>317</sup> Sab. *yḵwm* “rise!”, BHeb., Aram., Eth. *ḵūm* id.

*have arisen from a two-class system. This is the only conclusion to be drawn from the fact that in ancient inflectional classes the masculine and feminine do not differ in their inflexion, but together contrast with the neuter: e.g. πατήρ, μήτηρ».*

On the other hand, HS distinguishes two grammatical genders: *masculine and feminine*. But in many cases the masculine and feminine have *the same form* in *nouns and adjectives*, i.e. *zero morpheme*, and in some others the feminine marker /-t/ is used with the masculine. Moreover, the masculine and feminine have the same case endings (nom., acc., gen.): see §2.9 above.

Consideration of the above-mentioned facts gives the following picture of gender developments through stages in IE and HS.

1) Proto-IE-HS: 1<sup>st</sup> stage. A natural gender expressed by means of lexical opposition had been in existence at this stage and visible traces of it have been preserved in all IE-HS languages, e.g. Skt. sūnu- “son”, fem. duhitar-; bhrātar- “brother”, fem. svasar-, English ox-cow, horse-mare, cock-hen, etc., CA ’abu “father”, fem. ’ummu; ḥimāru “ass”, fem. ’atān; ḡamalu “camel”, fem. nāḡatu, etc.<sup>318</sup>

2) 2<sup>nd</sup> stage. Proto-IE-HS monosyllabic *demonstrative pronouns*, the earliest and basic indicators of gender, were split into *masculine* and *feminine* via the process of ‘voicing or devoicing’ the consonant. Consider the following examples from CA:

(2a) *tā, tī or tih* “this” is the fem. counterpart of masc *ḡī* (LA, r. ty, تى);

*tāni* dual is the fem. counterpart of masc. dual *ḡāni* (LA, r. ḡā, تان): see n. 2c below, also Wright, 1962: §340.

(2b) The IE corresponding forms are:

OCS masc., nom. *tŭ*, Lith. *tas*, Skt., Goth. *sa* = CA masc. nom. *ḡū* (Amorite *zū*, OArām. *z’*, Heb. *zē*, fem. *zōt*, Eth. *zə*, fem. *zā*, etc. see §2.20.1, n. 2a above.

OCS masc. acc. *tŭ*, Lith. *ta*, Skt. *tam*, Goth. *hana* = CA masc. acc. *ḡā*.

OCS fem. nom. *to*, Lith. fem. *ta*, Skt. *sā*, Goth. *sō* = CA *ḡātu* (*tī* above or *ḡī*: gen.): see §3.5.2 above.

(2c) The IE dual forms are:

Skt. masc. nom.-acc. *tā(u)*, OCS *tā* = CA *ḡaway*, *ḡawāni*, *ḡāni* above (LA).

The interchange between /s-/ and /t-/ in the IE declensional paradigm is by itself evidence that they both go back to an earlier consonant different from either; *it is an interdental fricative*. In HS, a similar interchange has already been seen between masc. /ḡ/ and fem. /t/ (see 2a above). Also consider

CA masc. nom. dual *hā-ḡāni*, fem. *hā-tāni*.

3) 3<sup>rd</sup> stage: in Proto-IE-HS certain affixes associated with gender began to develop, like fem. /-t/, fem. /-ā/, etc., and grammatical gender began to creep into the language.

<sup>318</sup> The gradual decrease of this method of gender distinction over time coincides with the progressive use of other means of marking gender distinction such as the use of *the same word with a distinct gender form* as in Av. *aspa-* “horse”, fem. *aspā*, CA *bin* “son”, fem. *bint*, Lat. *gallus* “cock”, fem. *gallīna*, etc.

4) 4<sup>th</sup> stage, a stage at which IE and HS broke up their unity.

4a) The IE family developed a neuter gender, but see below.

#### Comments

I still have few words to say with ‘*caution and preservation*’ about ‘*neuter gender*’ and its connection with the 4<sup>th</sup> stage *only* in IE. CA has, *among some other grammatical features*, two interrogatives:

a) *man*, traditionally called *li* (= for) ‘*al*’ (= the) ‘*ākīl*’ (= one endowed with reason), i.e. *masc. or fem. human being*,

b) *mā*, traditionally called *li* (= for) ‘*yairi*’ (= other than) ‘*al*’ ‘*ākīl*’ = lit. ‘*one un-endowed with reason*, i.e. *non-human; things and animals* (for their cognates and their ultimate origin, see §2.20.1, n. 2f above), e.g.

*mā hādā what is this?* (referring to *non-human*). The answer may be: *this is a cow, stone, briefcase, etc.*

*man hādā who is this?* (referring only to *human*). The answer may be: *this is a friend, Ali, John, etc.*

The general idea gathered from the foregoing section should be that, as far as ‘*concord*’ or ‘*agreement*’ is concerned, CA distinguishes two genders: ‘*human*’ = *endowed with reason* and ‘*non-human*’ = *un-endowed with reason*.

In a simple sentence consisting of VSO/C (subject, verb, object/complement), plural, plural of the plural, and collective nouns require a singular verb, exactly like any singular noun. The following examples clearly illustrate this fact:

i) ‘*akala*’ (sg. vb = ate) ‘*al*’ (= the) *waladu* (= child) ~ ‘*al*’ *awladu* (= the children) “the child/ the children ate”,

ii) ‘*akala-t*’ (-t = a fem. marker, i.e. 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. sg.) ‘*al*’ *bintu* (= girl) ~ ‘*al*’ *banātu* (= pl. the girls) “the girl/ the girls ate”,

iii) ‘*akala*’ ‘*al*’ *ḥayawānu* (= animal) ~ ‘*al*’ *baḥāru* (= coll. the cows) “the animal / the cows ate”,

iv) ‘*akala-t*’ (see -t above) ‘*al*’ *ḥayawānātu* (pl. the animals) ~ ‘*al*’ *baḥāra-tu* (= the cow) ~ ‘*al*’ *abḥūru* (= pl. of coll. the cows) “the animals/ the cow/ the cows ate”,

v) *saḥāṭa* (sg. vb = fell) ‘*al*’ *ḥaḡāru* (= the stone) but *saḥāṭa-t* (see -t above) ‘*al*’ *aḥḡāru* (pl. the stones) “the stones fell”.

The examples set forth above show that all nouns regardless of *the number* take *singular verb agreement*, and that the sole difference between them lies only in the form of the verb whether it is fem., ending in the suffixed pers. pron. -t and referring to *she/it* or masc. with ‘*zero ending*’, referring to *he/it*. *One can freely use the imperfect forms* with the same grammatical subjects: *ya’kulu* “*he/it eats*”, *ta’kulu* “*she/it eats*”, *yasḥūtu* “*he/it falls*”, *tasḥūtu* “*she/it falls*”.

If, however, the simple sentence begins with any auxiliary or some particles (*kāna* “*be*” and its sister auxiliaries, *kāda* and its sister verbs denoting “*be about or be near to*”, ‘*inna*’ and its sister particles, etc.), the word order will become *Aux. S V* and the marked difference in gender between *human* and *non-human* will become evident; all *human plural nouns* take plural verb agreement and all *non-human plural nouns* take singular



verb agreement.

'inna (verily) 'al 'awlādu (= the children) ya'kulūn (masc. pl. verb: eat),  
'al banātu (= the girls) ya'kulna (fem. pl. vb: eat),

kāna (masc. sg. was) {or 'inna above} 'al baqaru (= coll. cows) ya'kulu (= sg. verb: eats),

kāna-t (see -t above) 'al ḥayawānātu (= pl. animals) ta'kulu (= sg. verb: eats),  
'al 'aḥḡāru (= the stones) taḡuḡu (= sg. verb: falls).

Another example: lā (= neither) 'al baqaru ya'kulu wa (= and) lā (= nor) 'al ḥayawānātu ta'kulu wa (= and) lā (= nor) 'al 'aḥḡāru taḡuḡu: lit. “\*neither the cows eats and nor the animals eats and nor the stones falls”. Putting them in the *perfect* tense: lā 'al baqaru 'akala wa lā 'al ḥayawānātu 'akala-t wa lā 'al 'aḥḡāru saḡaḡa-t.

The lack of ‘concord’ between *non-human* plural nouns and the verb has been preserved intact, together with (‘perhaps’) *S V* word order, in Hittite, Grk, and OAv. In such IE languages the neuter plural takes singular verb agreement as in Grk *zōia* (= animals) *trékhei* (= sg. verb: run) “\*the animals runs”.

From all what have been said in this section, we may conclude that IE-HS ‘gender’ was originally independent of morphology *in the sense that all morphological endings distinguishing gender are later developments*, and that nouns were originally classified as human (masc./fem.) and non-human (things and animals) on a purely semantic basis rather than grammatical one. The *essence* of this system has been preserved only in Hitt. and CA.

## REFERENCES

- Abraham, R. C. 1959. *The Language of the Housa People*. London.  
1962. *Somali English Dictionary*. London.
- Adams, Douglas Q. 1989. *A Dictionary of Tocharian. B*. Rodopi, Amsterdam.
- Aitchison, Jean. 1991. *Language Change: Progress or Decay?* 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Cambridge University Press.
- Albright, William. 1927. *Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology III*. JAOS, Vol. 47, pp. 201-236.
- Ali, Mir Ahmad. 1988. *The Holy Koran, with Translation and Commentary*. New York.
- Altmann, S. (ed.). 1967. *Social Communication among Primates*. University of Chicago Press.
- Anderson, James M. 1973. *Structural Aspects of Language Change*. Longman, London.
- Anttila, Raimo. 1972. *An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Macmillan, New York.
- Applegate, Joseph R. 1958. *An Outline of the Structure of Shilha*. American Council of Learned Societies, New York.  
1975. *Semantic Correlates of Berber Syntactic Patterns*. In James and Theodora Bynon (eds), *Hamito-Semitic*, pp. 291-293. The Hague.

Arlotto, Anthony. 1972. *Introduction to Historical Linguistics*. Houghton Mifflin Company. New York.

Atkinson, Martin, David Kilby and Iggy Roca. *Foundations of General Linguistics*. London.

Basset A. and Picard A. 1948. *Éléments de Grammaire Berbère*. Paris.

Bateson, Mary C. 1962. *Arabic Language Handbook*. Leipzig.

Beekes, Robert S. P. 1995. *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*. Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia.

Beeston, A. F. L. et al. 1982. *Sabaeen Dictionary*. Beirut.

1962. *A Descriptive Grammar of Epigraphic South Arabian*. Luzac & Co. Ltd. London.

Benveniste, E. 1973. *Indo-European Language and Society*. Transl. by E. Palmer. London.

Bomhard, Allan R. 1969. *The Indo-European Phonological System: New Thoughts about its Reconstruction and Development*. Orbis XXVIII/1, pp. 66-110.

1975. *An Outline of the Historical Phonology of Indo-European*. Orbis XXIV, pp. 354-390.

1976. *The Placing of the Anatolian Languages*. Orbis XXV/2, pp. 199-239.

1981. *Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic: New evidence for the Connection*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

1996. *Indo-European and the Nostratic Hypothesis*. Charleston, SC: Signum Publishing.

Branden, Alb. Van Den. 1950. *Les Inscriptions Thamoudéenes*. Louvain-Heverlé.

Brugmann, Karl. 1904. *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen*. Reprinted 1970, Berlin.

Buck, Karl D. 1933. *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. The University of Chicago Press. 8<sup>th</sup> impression 1962.

1949. *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*. The University of Chicago Press.

Budge, E. A. Wallis. 1978. *Egyptian Language*. 16<sup>th</sup> impression. Routledge & Kegan Paul Limited, Britain.

1978. *Egyptian Hieroglyphic Dictionary*, 2 Volumes. Dover Publications, Inc.

New York.

Burrow, Thomas. 1973. *The Sanskrit Language*. Faber & Faber, London.

Bynon, Theodora. 1977. *Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press. Reprinted 1986.

Campbell, A. 1964. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford.

Cantineau, J. 1932. *Le Nabatéen*. Paris.

Carnochan, Jack. 1975. *Bachama and Chadic*. In James and Theodora Bynon (eds), in *Hamito-Semitic*, pp. 459-485. The Hague.

Carlton, Terence R. (1990). *Introduction to the phonological History of the Slavic Languages*. Columbus: Slavica.

Castellino, G. R. 1975. *Gender in Cushitic*. In James and Theodora Bynon (eds), *Hamito-Semitic*, pp. 333-359. The Hague.

Chejne, A. G. 1969. *The Arabic Language and its Role in History*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Childs, G. Tucker. 2003. *An Introduction to African Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Chomsky, Noam. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.

1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT Press.

1968. *Language and Mind*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York.

1986. *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*. Praeger, New York.

and Halle, Morris. 1968. *Sound Pattern of English*. Harper and Row, New York.

Cohen, David. 1970. *Étude de Linguistique Sémitique et Arabe*. Mouton, The Hague: Paris.

1993/95. *Dictionnaire des Racines Sémitiques ou Attestées dans les Langues Sémitiques*. Fascicules 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. Peeters, Belgium.

1970. *Dictionnaire des Racines Sémitique ou attestées dans les Langues Sémitiques*. Fascicules 1, 2. Mouton and Co. The Netherlands.

Cohen, Marcel. 1931. *Études D'Éthiopien Méridional*. Paris.

1969. *Essai Comparatif sur le vocabulaire et la phonétique du chamito-sémitique*. Paris.

Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. University of Chicago.

1987. *The World's Major Languages*. Groom Helm, London.

Cooke, G. A. 1903. *A text-Book of North Semitic Inscriptions*. Oxford.

Croft, William. 2003. *Typology and Universals*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Cambridge University Press.

Cowgill, Warren. 1965. *Evidence In Greek*. In Werner Winter (ed.), *Evidence for Laryngeals*, pp. 142-180. The Hague.

Crystal, David. 1987. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge University Press. Reprinted 1992.

Darwin, Charles. 1869. *On the Origin of Species*. Murray, Britain.

Daryabadi, A. M. 2004. *The Koran: Translation and Commentary of the Holy Koran*. Dar Ibin Katheer, Beirut.

Delamarre, X. 1984. *Le Vocabulaire Indo-Européenne*. Paris.

D'hauterive, Grandsaignes R. 1949. *Dictionnaire de Racines des Langues Européennes*. Paris.

Diakonoff, I. M. 1965. *Semito-Hamitic Languages*. Moscow.

1975. *On root stucture in proto- Semitic*. In James and Theodora Bynon (eds), *Hamito-Semita*, pp. 133-151. The Hague.

1975. *Problems of Root Structure in Proto-Semitic*. *Archiv Orientalni* 38, 1970, pp. 453-480.

and Neroznak, V. P. 1985. *Phrygian*. New York.

1988. *Afrasian Languages*. Moscow.

Diamond, A. S. 1965. *The History and Origin of Language*. The Citadel Press. New York.

Diringer, D. 1948. *The Alphabet: A key to the History of Mankind*. London.

Drower, E. S. and Macuch R. *A Mandaic Dictionary*. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, London.

Ellis, Jeffrey. 1966. *Towards a general Comparative Linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton.

Ehret, Christopher. 1995. *Reconstructing Proto-Afro-Asiatic: Vowels, tone, Consonants, and Vocabulary*. University of California Press.

Fisiak, Jacek (ed.). 1980. *Historical Morphology*. The Hague: Mouton.

Fleisch, H. 1968. *L'Arabe Classique, Esquisse d'une structure linguistique*. Paris.  
1947. *Introduction à l'étude des langues Sémitique*. Paris.

Foot, E. C. 1913. *A Galla-English, English-Galla Dictionary*. Cambridge.

Foreest, R. A. D. 1948. *The Chinese Language*. Faber and Faber Ltd. London.

Fortson, Benjamine W. 2004. *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*. Blackwell Publishing.

Fox, Anthony. 1995. *Linguistic Reconstruction: An Introduction to Theory and Method*. Oxford University.

Fromkin, Victoria A. (ed.). *Linguistics: An Introduction to Linguistic Theory*. Blackwell Publishers.

Fronzaroli, P. 1975. *On the Common Semitic Lexicon and its Ecological and Cultural Background*. In James and Theodora Bynon (eds), *Hamito-Semitic*, pp. 43-53. The Hague.

Gardiner, Alan. 1973. *Egyptian Grammar*. Oxford University Press, London.

Gelb, I. J. 1952. *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 1961.

1961. *The Early History of the West Semitic Peoples*. *Journal of Cuneiform studies*, 15, 27-47.

1969. *Sequential Reconstruction of Proto-Akkadian*. University of Chicago Press.

Gesenius, William. 1850. *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Crocker and Brewster, Boston. Transl. by Edward Robinson.

Giacumakis, George. 1970. *The Akkadian of Alalah*. The Hague: Mouton.

Gordon, Cyrus H., 1965, *Ugaritic Textbook: Grammar, Texts in Translation, Cuneiform Selections, Glossary Indices*. Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome.

Goetze, Albrecht in cooperation with Edgar H. Sturtevant, 1938. *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi*. New Haven, Connecticut.

Gray, Louis Herbert. 1971. *Introduction to Semitic Comparative Linguistics*. Columbia University Press.

Greenberg, J. H. 1950. *The patterning of root morphemes in Semitic*. Word 6, 162-181.

1952. *The Afro-Asiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Present*. JAOS, 72, pp. 1-9.

1963. *The Languages of Africa*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Indiana University Press.

1987. *Language in the Americas*. Stanford University Press.

Gray, Louis H. 1939. *Foundations of Language*. New York.

Gurney, Oliver R. 1954. *The Hittites*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Penguin books, Baltimore.

Hamp, Eric P. 1965. *Evidence in Albanian*. In Werner Winter (ed.), *Evidence for Laryngeal*, pp. 123-141. The Hague.

1965. *Evidence in Keltic*. In Werner Winter (ed.), *Evidence for Laryngeal*, pp. 224-235

Harris, Zellig. 1936. *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*. New Haven, Connecticut.

Hetzron, Robert. 1975. *Genetic Classification and Ethiopic Semitic*. In James and Theodora Bynon (eds), *Hamito-Semitic*, pp. 43-53. The Hague.

Hock, Hans Henrich. 1986. *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. Berlin.

Hock, Hans Henrich and Joseph Brian D. 1996. *Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship: An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Mouton de Gruyter, The Hague. Berlin.

Hodge, Carleton T. 1975. *Egyptian and Its Survival*. In James and Theodora Bynon (eds), *Hamito-Semitic*, pp. 171-189. The Hague.

Hoenigswald, Henry M. *Indo-Iranian Evidences*. In Werner Winter (ed.), *Evidence for Laryngeals*, pp. 93-99. The Hague.

Hoftijzer, J. and Jongeling K. 1995. *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*. Volumes I & II. Leiden, The Netherlands.

Hudson-Williams, T. 1963. *A short Grammar of Old Persian*. The University of Wales Press.

Hurwitz, Solomon T. H. 1966. *Root-Determinatives in Semitic Speech*. AMS Press Inc. New York.

- Huyghe, P. G. 1901. *Dictionnaire Kabyle-Français*. Paris.
- Hymes, Dell. 1964. *Language in Culture and Society*. Harper and Row, New York.
- Jackendoff, R. 1983. *Semantic and Cognition*. MIT Press, Cambridge.  
1990. *Semantic Structures*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Jasanoff, Jay. 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford University Press.
- Jean, Charles F. and Hoftijzer, J. 1965. *Dictionnaire Sémitic de L'Ouest*, Leiden.
- Johannesson, Alexander. 1949. *Origin of Language*. Reykjavik.
- Jones, Charles (ed.). 1993. *Historical Linguistics: Problems and Perspectives*. Longman, London and New York.
- Karlgren, Bernhard. 1931. *Tibetan and Chinese*. T'oung Pao, Second Series, Vol. 28, No. 1/2 (1931), pp. 25-70. Published by: Brill, Leiden.  
1949. *The Chinese Language: an Essay on its Nature and History*. The Ronald Press Company, New York.
- Katamba, Francis. 1993. *Morphology*. Macmillan, London.
- Katzner, Kenneth. 1975. *The Languages of the Word*. Funk & Wagnalls. New York.
- Keiler, Allan R. 1970. A Phonological Study of the Indo-European Laryngeals. The Hague, Mouton.  
(ed.) 1972. *A reader in Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York.
- Kenyon, Kathleen. 1966. *Amorites and Canaanites*. London.
- Kerns, Alexander J. and Schwartz, Benjamin. *The Laryngeal Hypothesis and Indo-Hittite, Indo-European Vocalism*. Journal of the American Oriental Society 60, 1940, 181-192.
- King, W. 1898. *First steps in Assyrian*. London.
- Kirk, J. W. C. 1905. *A Grammar of the Somali Language*. Cambridge, London.
- Kurylowicz, Jerzy. 1935. *Étude Indoeuropéenne*, vol. I. Karkow.  
1964. *The inflectional Categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg.
- Lass, Roger. 1980. *On Explaining Language Change*. Cambridge University Press.



- Lehmann, Winfred. P. 1963. *Historical Linguistics*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston Press.  
 1965. *Germanic Evidence*. In Werner Winter (ed.), *Evidence for Laryngeal*, pp. 212-223. The Hague.  
 1973. *A Structural Principle of Language and its Implications*. *Language* 49: 47-66.  
 1974. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. The University of Texas Press.  
 1980. *Proto-Indo-European Phonology*. The University of Texas.  
 1993. *Theoretical Bases of Indo-European Linguistics*. Routledge, London.
- Lieberman, Philip. 1975. *On the Origins of Language: An Introduction to evolution of Human Speech*. Macmillan, New York.
- Lieber, R. 1981. *Morphology and Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Leslau, Wolf. 1963. *Etymological Dictionary of Hariri*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Lieber, Rochelle. 1992. *Reconstructing Morphology: Word Formation in Syntactic Theory*. Chicago University Press.
- Lockwood, W. B. 1969. *Indo-European Philology: Historical and Comparative*. Hutchinson, London.  
 1972. *A Panorama of Indo-European Languages*. Hutchinson, London.
- Makki, El Rabih. 1989. 1991. *A linguistics Introduction to the History of English*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Bissan Publishers and Distributers, Beirut.  
 and Najwa Nasr. 2012. *Phonology: A Course Book*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Bissan Publishers and Distributers, Beirut.
- Mallowan, M. E. L. 1965. *Early Mesopotamia and Iran*. Thames and Hudson, London.
- Mann, Stuart E. 1984-1987. *An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary*. Hamburg, Helmut Buske.
- Martinet, André. 1975, *Évolution des langue et Reconstruction*. Paris.  
 Marton, George A. 1934. *Semitic and Hamitic Origins: Social and Religious*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.  
 Masica, Colin P, 1991. *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, P. H. 1974. *Morphology: An Introduction to the Theory of Word-Formation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1972. *A Sanskrit Grammar*. Transl. by Gordon B. Ford. The

University of Alabama Press.

Meillet, Antoine. 1924. *Introduction à l'Étude Comparative des Langues Indo-Européenne*. Librairie Hachette, Paris. Reprinted by Alabama Press, 1964.

1970. *General Characteristics of the Germanic Languages*. Transl. by William P. Dismules. University of Miami Press.

and Marcel Cohen. 1952. *Les langues du Monde*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Paris.

Melchert, H. Graig. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam.

Miller, Roy Andrew. 1971. *Japanese and Other Altaic Languages*. University of Chicago Press.

Möller, Hermann. 1906. *Semitisch und Indogermanisch*. Hildesheim. Reprinted 1978.

Moore, Samuel. 1967. *Historical Outlines of English Sounds and Inflections*. Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Moorhouse, A. C. 1946. *Writing and the Alphabet*. London.

Moscatti, Sabatino ed. 1969. *An Introduction to the comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*. Wiesbaden.

Müller, Walter W. 1975. *Beiträge zur Hamito-Semitischen Wortvergleichung*. In *Hamito-Semitica*, edited by James and Theodora Bynon, pp. 63-73. The Hague.

Murtonen, A. 1967. *Early Semitic*. Leiden.

O'Leary, De Lacy. 1969. *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Language*. Philo Press, Amsterdam.

Orel, Vladimir and Stolbova, Olega. 1995. *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary: Material for Reconstruction*. Leiden.

Oswald, J. L. Szemerényi. 1990. *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Oxford University press.

Palmer, L. R. 1954. *The Latin Language*. Faber & Faber, London.

Parsons, F. W. 1975. *Housa and Cushitic*. In James and Theodora Bynon (eds), *Hamito-Semitica*, pp. 421-455. The Hague.

Pederson, Holger. 1959. *The Discovery of Language: Linguistic Science in the 19<sup>th</sup> century*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

and Henry Louis. 1961. *A Concise Comparative Celtic Grammar*. 1<sup>st</sup> edition 1937. Germany.

Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2012. *Languages of the World: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Pinker, Steven. 1994. *The Language Instinct: How the mind Creates Language*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Polomé, Edgar C. 1965. *The Laryngeal Theory so far: A Critical Bibliographical Survey*. In Werner Winter (ed.), *Evidence for Laryngeals*, pp. 9-78. The Hague.  
(ed.). 1990. *Research Guide on Language Change*. Berlin.

Prass, Karl-G. 1975. *The Reconstruction of Proto-Berber Short Vowel*. In James and Theodora Bynon (eds), *Hamito-Semitic*, pp. 215-228. The Hague.

Puhvel, Jaan. 1965. *Evidence in Anatolian*. In Werner Winter (ed.), *Evidence for Laryngeals*, pp. 79-92. The Hague.

Pulleyblank, E. G. 1965. *The Indo-European Vowel System and the Qualitative Ablaut*. Word, Volume 21, n. 1.

Rabin, Chaim. 1975. *Lexicostatistics and the Internal Division of Semitic*. In James and Theodora Bynon (eds), *Hamito-Semitic*, pp. 83-99. The Hague.

Robbeets, Martine Irma. 2005. *Is Japanese Related to Korean, Tungus, Mongolic and Turkic?* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Robins, R. H. 1997. *A short History of Linguistics*. 4<sup>th</sup> edition. New York, longman.

Rosenthal, Franz. 1963. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. Wiesbaden.  
(ed.). 1976. *An Aramaic Handbook*. Wiesbaden.

Ruhlen, Merritt. 1994. *On the Origin of Language : Studies in Linguistic Taxonomy*. Stanford University Press.

Ryder, Stuart A. 1974. *The D-Stem in Western Semitic*. Mouton, Paris.

Samuels, M. L. 1972. *Linguistics Evolution*. Cambridge University Press.

Sihler, Andrew. 2000. *Language History: An Introduction*. Benjamins, Philadelphia.

Shehadeh, Lamia A. R. 1968. *The Sibilants in the West Semitic Languages*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Harvard University, Massachusetts.

Schmalstieg, William R. 1980. *Indo-European Linguistics: a New Synthesis*. Pennsylvania.

1975. *Lithuanian a and the Evolution of Indo-European Vocalic system*. Baltistica XI (I), pp. 7-20.

Sebeok, T. A. ed. 1977. *How Animals Communicate*. Indiana University Press.

Senner, Wayne (ed.). 1989. *The origin of writing*. University of Nebraska Press.

Skeat, Walter W. 1912. *The Science of Etymology*. Oxford.

Skinner, Neil. 1975. *The Hausa Genitive morpheme as an exponent of Gender: a query*. In James and Theodora Bynon (eds), *Hamito-Semitic*, pp. 389-294. The Hague.

Smith, W. Robenson and De Goeje, M. J. (eds). 1962. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. Vol. I. Cambridge at the University Press.

Stassen, L. 1985. *Comparison and Universal Grammar*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Stehle, Dorothy. 1940. *Sibilants and Emphatics in South Arabian*. JAOS, Vol. 60, pp. 507-543.

Štekauer, Pavol; Valera, Salvador, and Körtvélyessy, Lívía. 2012. *Word-Formation in the World's Languages: A Typological Survey*. Cambridge University Press.

Stopa, Roman. 1972. *Structure of Buchman and its traces in Indo-European*. Poland.

Sturtevant, Edgar H. *The Indo-European Voiceless Aspirates*. Language, Volumes 16-18, 1940-1942, pp. 1-11.

1942. *The Indo-Hittite Laryngeals*. Baltimore.

1947. *An Introduction to Linguistic Science*. Yale University Press.

and Hahn, E. Adelaide. 1951. *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Yale University Press. New Haven.

Szemerényi, Oswald J. L. 1972. *Comparative Linguistics*, in Current Trends in Linguistics ix, pp. 119-195.

1990. *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Taylor, F. W. 1959. *A practical Housa Grammar*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxford University Press.

Thacker, T. W. 1954. *The relationship of the Semitic and Egyptian Verbal System*. Oxford, London.

Tucker, A. N. 1956. *The Non-Bantu Languages of North-Eastern Africa*. International African Institute, Oxford University Press.

1959. *A Practical Housa Grammar*. Oxford University Press.

Tyloch, Witold. 1975. *The Evidence of Proto-Lexicon for the Cultural Background of the Semitic Peoples*. In James and Theodora Bynon (eds), *Hamito-Semitic*, pp. 193-199, Paris, Mouton.

Ullendorff, E. 1955. *The Semitic language of Ethiopia: a Comparative Phonology*. London.

Vergote, J. 1975. *La Position Intermédiaire de L'ancien Égyptien entre L'Hébreu et L'Arabe*. In James and Theodora Bynon (eds).

Vycichl, Werner. 1975. *Egyptian and the other Hamito-Semitic Languages*. In James and Theodora Bynon (eds), *Hamito-Semitic*, pp. 201-210, Mouton, Paris.

Walde, Alois and Pokorny, Julius. 1973. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprachen*. Berlin und Leipzig 1930. Reprinted 1973.

Watkins, Calvert (ed.). 1985. *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.

1965. *Evidence in Balto-Slavic*. In Werner Winter (ed.), *Evidence for Laryngeals*, pp. 117-122. The Hague.

Welmers, W. 1973. *African Language Structures*. University of California Press.

Winter, Werner. 1965a. *Armenian Evidence*. In Werner Winter (ed.), *Evidence for Laryngeals*, pp.100-115. The Hague.

1965b. *Tocharian Evidence*. In Werner Winter (ed.), *Evidence for Laryngeal*, pp. 190-211. The Hague.

and Edgar C. Polomé (eds). 1992. *Reconstructing Languages and Cultures*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Wright, Joseph. 1962. *Historical Germanic Grammar*. Vol. I. 1<sup>st</sup> edition 1907, Oxford University Press.

1962. *Grammar of the Gothic Language*. Oxford University Press.

Wright, W. 1966. *Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic languages*. The Netherlands. First published 1890, Cambridge.

(ed.).1962. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. Vol. I. Cambridge University Press.

Zaborski, Andrzej. 1975. *Material for a comparative Dictionary of Cushitic Languages:*

*Somali-Galla Comparison*. In James and Theodora Bynon (eds), *Hamito-Semitic*, pp. 321-330.

### *Arabic References:*

Abu 'Assāf, Ali. 1988. *Al Aramiyyūn wa lughātuhum*. Dar Amāni, Syria.

Al Qālī, Ismā'īl Al Qāsim. *Kitābu Al Amāli*, 2 Volumes. Dar Al Jīl (1987), Beirut.

Al Anbārī, Muhammad Bin Qasim. *Kitābu Al Addād*. Muhammad Ibrāhim (ed.). Al Maktaba Al 'Aşriyyah (1991), Beirut.

*Gharīb Al Lughah*. Dār Al Fardaws (1989), Beirut.

Al Zajāji, Abdul Rahman. *Amāli Al Zajāji*, 2 Volumes. Abdul Salām Harūn (ed.). Dār Al Jīl, Beirut (1987).

Baili, Ahmad. 1988. *Al Ikhtilāf Bain Al qirā'āt*. Dār Al Jīl, Beirut.

Bin Aqīl, Bahā' Ad dīn. *Sharh Bin Aqīl 'ala Alfīyat Ibin Mālik*, 2 Volumes. Al Maktabah Al 'Aşriyyah (1964), Beirut.

Bin Faris, Ahmad. *Maqāyis Al Lughah*, 6 Volumes. Abdul Salām Hārūn (ed.). Dār Al Islāmiyyah (1990). Beirut.

*Al Şāhibi*. Umar F. Tabbā' (ed.). Maktabat Al Ma'ārif (1993). Beirut.

Bin Durayd, Muhammad Bin Al Hasan. *Kitāb Jamharah Al Lughah*, 3 Volumes. Ramzi B'albaki (ed.). Dār Al 'ilm Lilmalāyin (1987). Beirut.

Bin Jinni, Uthmān. *Al Khaşā'ish*, 3 Volumes. M. A. Najjār (ed.). Dār Al Kitāb Al Arabi. Beirut.

Bin Hishām, Abdu Allah J. *Sharh Shuḍūr Al Thahab*. Muhammad Abdu Allah (ed.). Al Maktabah Al 'Aşriyyah, Beirut.

Bin Mandūr, Jamāl Al Dīn M. *Lisān Al Arab*, 4 Volumes. Yusif Khayāt (ed.). Dār Lisān Al Arab, Beirut.

Bukhāri, Muhammad Bin Ismā'īl. *Şahih Al Buhāri*, 4 Volumes. Dar Al Ma'rifah, Beirut.

Bustāni, Kamil. 1985. *Al Nuşūş Al finikiyyah fi qarāh Tibyah*. Lebanese University Press, Beirut.

Duminiki, Marmarji (1937). *Al Mu'jamiyyah Al Arabiyyah fi Thaw' Al Thunā'iyyah wa Al Alsuniyyah As-Sāmiyyah*. Al quds, Palestine.

Farāhidi, Khalīl bin Ahmad. *Kitābu Al 'Ayn*, 8 Volumes. M. Mahzūmi and A. Samarrā'i (eds), Manshurāt Al A'lami (1990), Beirut.

Haffner, August. (1971). *Thalathat Kutub fi Al Addād*. Dār Al Kutub Al 'ilmiyyah, Beirut.

Haarmann, Holman. 2006. *Tāriḥ Al Lughāt wa Mustaqbaluha*. Trans. Sāmi Sham'un, Douḥa, Qatar.

Isreal, Wolfenson. 1929. *Tāriḥ Al Lughāt Al Sāmiyah*. Matba'at Al I'timād, Egypt.

Jawād, Ahmad. 2009. *Madkhal ila Al Lughah Al Kin 'āniyah Al Finiḳiyyah*. University of Damascus Press.

Jawhari, Ismā'īl Bin Hammād. *Al Ṣiḥāḥ*, 6 Volumes. Ahmad Attār (ed.). Dār Al 'ilm Lilmalāyin (1984), Beirut.

Karl, Brugmann. 1977. *Fiḳḥ Al Lughāt Al Sāmiyah*. Transl. by Ramadan Abdul Tawwāb. Riyādh University Press. Saudi Arabia.

Nawawi, Yahya Bin Sharaf. *Taḥṯīb Al Asmā' wa Al Lughāt*, 2 Volumes. Muṣṭafa Ata (ed.). Dār Al kutub Al 'ilmiyyah (2007), Beirut.

Nisabūri, Ahmad Bin Muhammad. *Majma' Al Amthāl*, 2 Volume. Muhammad M. Abdul Hamīd (ed.). Dār Al Ḳalam, Beirut.

Nöldke, T. *Al Lughāt Al Sāmiyah*. Transl. by Ramadan Abed Tauwāb, Cairo.

Sibawaiyh, Umar. *Al Kitāb*. Al Maṭba'h Al Amiriyah, 2 Volumes. Dār Al Nahḍah Al Arabiyyah (1316 H.), Egypt.

Sajistani, Sahl Bin Muhammad. *Kitābu Al Addād*. Muhammad A. Ahmad (ed.). Maktabat Al Nahḍah (1991), Egypt.

Sālim, Abdul Azīz. 1971. *Tāriḥ Al Arab Ḳabl Al Islām*. Dār An Nahḍah Al Arabiyyah. Beirut.

Ṣway'i, A. Azīz. 1999. *Uṣūl Al harf Al lībi*. Lybia.

Siyyuti, Jalāl Ad Dīn. *Al Muzhir Fi 'Ulūm Al Lughah wa Anwā'ihā*, 2 Volumes. M. Mawla, A. Bijāwi and M. Ibrahīm (eds). Dār Al Fikr, Beirut.

*Al Ittiḳān fi 'ulūm Al Koran*, 2 Volumes. Muhammad Ibrahīm (ed.). Manshurāt Al Sharīf Al Radi, bidār Azizi (1373 H).

Thahabi, M. Husein. *Al Tafsīr wa Al Mufasssirūn*, 3 Volumes. Ahmad Zu'bi (ed.). Sharikat Al Arḳam, Beirut.

Tha'ālibi, Abdul Malak Bin Ismā'īl. *Kitābu Fiqh Al Lughah wa Sirru Al Arabiyah*. Fā'iz Muhammad and Imil Ya'kūb (eds). Dār Al Kitāb Al Arabi (1993), Beirut.

Tawīl, R. 1972. *Al Taḍād fī Daw' Al Lughāt Al Sāmiyah*. Beirut Arab University Press. Beirut.

*Al Ibdāl fī Daw' Al Lughāt Al Sāmiyah*. Beirut Arab University Press, Beirut.

Thātha, Hasan. 1971. *Al Sāmiyūn wa Lughātuhum*. Maktabat Al dirāsāt Al Lughawiyah.

Zarkashi, Badr Ad Dīn. *Al Burhān Fi 'Ulum Al Kuran*, 4 Volumes. Muhammad Ibrāhīm (ed.). Dār Al Jīl (1988), Beirut.